PUBLISHERS — LAW BOOKS
PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS
The Carswell Company
LIMITED
145-149 ADELAIDE STREET WEST
TORONTO CANADA

THIRD SESSION

of the

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

of the

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

. . . . . .

1897

TORONTO, ONTARIO, WEDNESDAY 1, 1951, et seq.

. . . . . .

VOLUME XLII

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1951

. . . . . .

HON. (Rev.) M.C. DAVIES, - Speaker.

R.C. STURGEON
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
TORONTO

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER:As I have said on various occasions, we are privileged to have children of the various types of schools visiting the Assembly. Today we have a group of 35 from the East Burlington Public School, and representatives of the Ontario Ladies College, and, particularly, the 12th Grade Senior Boys from the Chatham Vocational School, who are visiting the City for three or four days, visiting the various industrial and business plants, and are spending some time at the Legislature today. I know we very, very heartily welcome these young men from the Chatham Vocational School.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(PAGE A-3 FOLLOWS)

MR. SPEAKER: I think, likewise, that it is befitting, we should take a few moments of the time of the Legislature to pay tribute to one of the most faithful employees we have had in our service, particularly as he has had a great deal to do with the services and work of the Legislative Chamber. I refer to Mr. Thomas Cordell who, after 33 years of service to the province of Ontario, is about to retire.

Mr. Cordell, I find, has been in the service under just one Clerk of the Assembly, but during that time he has had to put with eleven different Speakers, and I think any person who has been able to endure eleven Speakers is worthy of having a very fine retirement.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: To have been able to serve the very, very large number of hon. members of the Assembly, and to have been able to retain the respect of everyone, and still to be of great service, I think is something we cannot allow to pass without notice. Our very sincere hope is that when Mr. Cordell retires -- and I understand he is going to live in Peterborough, wherever that is --

HON. HAROLD SCOTT: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The applause seems to come from but one hon. member. However, I understand he is going to retire there, and I am confident that it is the wish of every hon. member of the Assembly that Mr. Cordell will be able to enjoy very many years of rest, and I hope in some kind of relaxing labor, and that he may enjoy his time with his family, and look back on the many years of service

and the many associations he has formed, and upon the splendid work he has performed for the province of Ontario, with a great deal of satisfaction and gratification.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to what you have said concerning Mr. Cordell. Anyone who has served for a third of a century in this Chamber has seen many changes in the life of Ontario. Mr. Cordell is pretty much of a fixture here. He is almost as much a fixture in this place as the desks, and the table, and the adornments around here, to say nothing of the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), whom I think has been here for 32 years, so Mr. Cordell tops him by one year.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things which has distinguished Mr. Cordell, in addition to his faithful service to the people of Ontario, is his unfailing courtesy to all the hon. members of this House. We appreciate that very much, and we extend to him and to his family the very best wishes on his retirement.

I might say to Mr. Cordell that I am glad he is going to the old historic town of Peterborough, but when he decided to go down into that district, he might well have come to Lindsay, which would have been better for him.

Hon. H.R. SCOTT : Oh,oh.

MR. FROST: However, I think he is making a good choice, and we certainly wish him well, and wish him health and happiness for many years.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr.

Speaker, I was very much interested, as other hon. members were, to hear about the imminent retirement of Mr. "Tom" Cordell. His youthful appearance is such that I could hardly believe his time to retire had come. However, the fact is that he served overseas in the early part of the First World War, and came back from overseas as a casualty by 1916, and two years later he entered the government service, joining the Department of Public Works.

He has been here a long time, and will be very much missed by the hon. members of this House, and no doubt by the Clerk of the Assembly, who has been Clerk even longer than Mr. Cordell has been associated with this sessional staff.

I think it would be interesting to note that Mr. Cordell has not only been one of the sessional staff -- and, in a sense, their chief for a good many years -- but he is also, Mr. Speaker, if I may be so bold as to use the word -- an artist, and I think most of the hon. members, if not all, have seen some examples of his work, and we have taken some satisfaction in the fact that if the hon. members of the House are not themselves artists, -- with one or two exceptions I might name -- we have an artist among those who are on the sessional staff.

I would also like to add, Mr. Speaker, while associating myself with those who have paid tribute to the work of a loyal and faithful servant, that I think we are obligated to the sessional staff particularly, for the excellent job they have done in connection with this Session, and the maintenance of this building generally.

Some of us have noticed I think some improvement in the amenities and the service here, and we want the members of the sessional staff to know we appreciate it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am sure that my friend, the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Doucett), who occupies the two portfolios of Highways and Public Works with so much distinction, will be interested to know that we on this side have noticed what we think is an improvement in the efficiency and courtesy of the employees in this service, in maintenance in this building, particularly in connection with the work in this House. That is true, not only of the maintenance staff, but it has been true, I think, this year of the Pages, those who have worked so hard with Mr. Cordell.

I think this much should be said, and at the same time we do wish to extend to Mr. Cordell our best wishes for many happy years of retirement, and as much happiness as can be realized in the district represented by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (M· Scott).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I would join with the other two Leaders in congratulating Mr. Cordell upon the many years of service he has rendered to this province. I think it is well in the dying days of this Session, that we should pause to reflect upon a lifetime of service which has been so well given by our friend, Mr. Cordell.

I have known Mr. Cordell over a quarter of a century,

and I would say that his efficiency has been overcome only by his curtesy. He has been an excellent public servant, and it is well that we should recall that at this time, and wish for him many years of enjoyment in a field that is perhaps more relaxing. I think it is a tribute to Mr. Cordell, that he has been able to serve here for 33 years, and retain not only his courtesy his patience and his efficiency, but his sanity.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: And he surely has retained that.

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I do want to join in this non-partisan tribute to Mr. Cordell. He is very non-partisan in the discharge of his duties, and discriminates against no one. So far as Mr. Cordell is concerned, there is neither government nor opposition; he gives all the hon. members of this House the benefit of his unfailing courtesy

Reference has been made to the fact that Mr. Cordell is an artist, and that he is going to spend his retirement in the sleepy town of Peterborough. It occurs to me that, as an artist, Mr. Cordell could very well devote the next few years of his life toward the creation of a composite of all the strange people he has seen in this Legislature during the past 33 years.

Mr. Speaker, we are very glad to join in the things which have been said by way of tribute to Mr. Cordell's service, and we, too, wish for him a long and happy life of creative retirement in the town of Peterborough.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests):

Mr. Speaker, in spite of this feeling of jealousy which has been manifested by various speakers regarding the choicest riding in Ontario, I would like to congratulate Mr. Cordell for his judgment in retiring to one of the finest cities in Canada, and I can sum it up best by saying that Toronto's loss is Peterborough's gain.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(PAGE A-9 FOLLOWS)

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and Receiving petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

Hon. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present to the House the following:

(1) The Fifth Annual Report of the Department of Travel and Publicity for the fiscal year 1950-1951.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to table answers to questions 264, 243 and 276.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, in connection with the questions, I would like to point out to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that there are still a number of questions on the Order Paper which undoubtedly involve a good deal of work. On the other hand, there are also a number which would appear on the face of them to involve very little work, and some of them have been standing since very early in the Session.

May I refer to the 1st question, that asked by the hon. member for East York (Miss MacPhail), on the first day of the Session as to the number of persons who are in receipt of mother's allowances, and what was the total number of their dependents, and the number to whom the discretionary supplementary allowances have been granted. One would think that the answer to that question would not be very difficult

to get.

There are a good many others in the same category, such as the question asked on the first day, by the hon. member for Hyde Park (Mr. Temple). I have not looked at those to which answers have been given today, but I can say this, Mr. Speaker, that there are a substantial number -- I think the government will agree -- which relate to fairly simple matters, but as to which we have had no answers as yet.

For example, there are five questions, numbers 36 to 40, in the name of the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park). These relate to certain sections of the Housing Development Act, and action taken thereunder, and I just do not understand why it should not be possible to get answers to them in a short space of time.

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that some Departments have been much more expeditious about that than others. The Department of Education seems to have done an exceptionally good job in getting answers. Some of the others have not come in, certainly not in the way they have from the Department of Education.

I am quite prepared to concede, as I said at the outset, that some of the questions which still stand do call for a great deal of work, and as for them, I have understanding and forgiveness, but there are a number of others which I think would call for very little work, and some of them have been on the Order Paper for over two months.

I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)

could give us some information about what we may expect later today, or tomorrow, with regard to these questions which could have been answered some weeks ago.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, a great multitude of questions asked this year have undoubtedly led to a delay in answering. Some of them would involve the employment of staff for weeks to get an answer together.

I often wonder whether the questions are asked really for any useful purpose. I had a case the other day of a question to which obviously an incorrect answer had been given, which we corrected ourselves. The answer was given some days before, and nobody seemed to notice it, which makes me wonder if all the work that is done in connection with answering these questions really adds up to anything or not.

MR. MACLEOD: Why did you ask them when you were in Opposition?

MR. FROST: I asked very, very few questions. I do not think I asked more than a handful during all that time. I went to the Public Accounts and dug these things up for myself. I asked questions in Public Accounts.

MR. MACLEOD: You never called the Committee.

MR. FROST: The Committee can be called at the instance of any hon. member. They are there for the service of the hon. members.

May I say to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) that when I was first in this House -- and this may seem strange to many of you -- myself and one or two others read the Public Accounts through from cover to cover, every page and every item in it, to find out what was doing in connection with

the different departments of the then Hepburn government. I would say, if the hon. members opposite would take that method instead of taking the easy way of asking questions, and causing hundreds of civil servants to spend their time in a way which be more usefully spent in other ways, it might lead to better government in this province.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) says there are some simple questions on the Order Paper. Maybe there are. Mr. Speaker, we do not look for the simple questions. We try to answer all the questions, and I would point out that we have not placed the questions in any priority at all. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) put them on the Order Paper, and we have endeavoured to deal with them --

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have not put any question on the Order Paper.

MR. FROST: I congratulate you for that. That is a very commendable example, which I would commend to some of the other hon. members of the House, and suggest they follow it.

I would like to give some typical questions. Here is one asked by the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder):

> "What is the total amount received by sheriffs in the province of Ontario for searches and for certificates in respect of executions in each of the last five years?"

Mr. Speaker, what in the world good would that do to anybody, if it were answered? I see the hon. member (Mr. Calder) is standing now in an endeavour to justify

that question.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will permit; the question was asked of me by a member of the Bar, who is now a candidate to become a Bencher, and was transferred word for word from his letter to the Order Paper.

MR. FROST: Well, if he is a candidate for a Bencher, he probably wanted the information so he can send out a lot of advertising.

I say to the hon. member (Mr. Calder) that he should not lend himself to a question of that kind. Aside from causing untold labor to the civil servants, I do not think the answer to the question would serve any good purpose.

Here is a question asked by the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley):

> "On what date did the Agricultural Development Act come into effect? In what other manner than by means of loans has agriculture development been promoted under the Act. What has been the number and amount of loans made in each year since the Act came into effect?" What is the number and amount of loans now outstanding? What has been the number and amount of loans defaulted in each year since the Act came into effect?"

That was an Act which came into effect in this province 30 years ago.

Hon. T.O. KENNEDY(Minister of Agriculture): In 1925.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, that was put in by my hon. friend (Mr. Nixon) who was at that time a member of the great Farmer Party, but toward the end switched to the "Modern Liberal Democracy".

> "What has been the amount recovered by fore-closure, sale, and so forth, in each year since the Act came into effect? What has been the amount of losses written off each year since the Act came into effect?"

What a question to ask.

> "What has been the number and amount of loans outstanding at the end of each fiscal year since the Act came into effect?"

30 years ago.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That information is all available.

MR. FROST: That may be, but why bother --

MR. J.L. DOWLING (Hamilton East): That is what they are getting paid for.

MR. FROST: The Order Paper is just full of examples like that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is a perfectly proper question.

MR. FROST: I was going to say it was foolish question No. one million nine hundred and eighty thousand. The hon. members will remember the funny pictures of years ago.

We have all sort of questions of that kind. Questions relating to advertising which would involve weeks of labor

to answer, and when they are answered, what conceivable good will they do to the hon. members of the House?

MR. Speaker, we have, I think, given every indication that we are trying to answer these questions. We started preparing the answers a week after the House convened, nearly nine weeks ago. I put in a great number of answers, and I think the hon. members will agree they are very good and complete answers.

It is going to be quite impossible to begin to answer these questions before the termination of the Session. I think what we will have to do is to make the balance subject to an order for return, and then I would not want to, in any way, say that we will attempt to answer all these questions. There are some of them I think we will simply have to let go by the Board, and if they are put on the Order Paper next year, we will put them first on the list, and answer them first, before answering any others.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that many of the questions on the Order Paper relate to important public matters, which should be available to the public.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) mentioned the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder), and what he regarded as a pointless question from that hon. member. I would point out the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) had another question on the Order Paper which he asked on February 8th:

"What properties in and near the city of Toronto were purchased by the government

for offices purposes since January 1st, 1949, and for what Departments of government were the purchases made?

From whom were such properties purchased?

For what amounts?

How were such amounts determined?"

MR. FROST: Well, just to take that question --

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is wrong with it.

MR. FROST:

"In and near the city of Toronto".

What does that mean? What is "near Toronto"? Some people might say that Peterborough or Lindsay were near Toronto --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Apparently it means greater Toronto.

MR. FROST: It does not say so. It says "in or near Toronto". What does that mean?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let me go on:

"For what department were the purchases made? "

Unless the government is unaware of what purchases it is making, and what properties it is buying, it should be possible to answer that question.

MR. FROST: I put in the answer to that question yesterday, and the answer was that the question was so vague, it would have to have further consideration.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is today's Order Paper.

MR. FROST: Well, I guess the printers are overworked.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This says:

"For what amount were these properties

purchased?"

That is a proper question for an hon. member of this House to ask. I am surprised that it is not possible in two months to get an answer to a question like that.

With respect to the question asked by the hon. member for Waterloo South (Mr. Isley) -- and he was a member of the Committee which discussed the history of the Act in question with the gentleman who has been administering it, or what is left of it, for some years past, and apparently he knows his job -- and having listened to him for some hours, there is no question but that he has all the information necessary to answer the question, and could give it in writing without too much trouble. And to say that it would involve the time of Civil servants for many weeks, is not just borne out by the facts.

Then, too, the questions relating to the work that is unfinished by this government - not answered, and it would seem to us they are not answered, because it would be a little embarrassing to answer them.

For example, the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) asked a question concerning the Hydro Electric Advisory Committee, but did not receive an answer. All he got was a bill. I suppose he can accept that in satisfaction. Apparently the government knows that for many years there has been statutory provision for an Advisory Committee, and yet all the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is getting in answer to his question is a bill.

MR. FROST: There have been 278 questiins asked. 168 have been answered up to date. That, I think, is pretty good in view of the fact that these questions involved voluminous answers to the questions.

I have here a question asked by the hon. member for Sault- Ste.Marie (Mr. Harvey), who is usually a very sensible individual, and I cannot think he wrote that question out himself; somebody did it for him. Here is the question:

"Enquiry of the Ministry: in respect of the .. Canada Highway:

1.(a) How much land has been acquired;

(b) From whom acquired, and

(c) At what price in each case.

2.How much land is still to be acquired?

3.What contracts for pre-construction work have been let,

(a) To what persons or companies;

(b) For what types of work;

(c) At what prices;

(d) For what milage, and

(e) In what locations?

4.What construction contracts have been let?

(a) To what persons or companies;

(b) For what types of work;

(c) At what prices?

(d) For what milage, and

(e) In what locations?

5. What contracts for material have been let?

(a) To what persons or companies?

(b) For what materials, and

(c) At what prices? "

This Highway runs all across the province.

MR. MILLARD: No, it zig-zags across the province.

MR. FROST: He wants to know how much land has been acquired; from whom it has been acquired, and what price, in each case. And there are a number of other questions.

Mr. Speaker, such a question as that is beyond all reason. If the hon. member (Mr. Harvey) should say: "How much land has been acquired in the township of so and so, or the municipality of so and so", it might be possible to answer it, but to ask our civil servants to get that information is almost impossible. There are points on the Trans-Canada Highway which the hon. member for Sault-Ste.Marie (Mr. Harvey) has never been on in his life, and neither have I, and it may be a long time until I am able to go up on that highway, and I would not know the land, or anything about it, and to get legal discriptions and names in answer to a question such as that, is simply beyond reason. What we do here, is to use our good judgment and good sense in trying to give the hon. members reasonable answers, but where the questions are unreasonable, we will have to strike them off; that is all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Will the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) look at questions 39 and 40?

MR. FROST: There have been so many questions asked.

We have endeavored to answer them. I imagine of the 168 answers given, only about 25% of them are of any real value to the hon. members of the House.

MR. MILLARD: You wait and see.

MR. TEMPLE: What is quite noteworthy is that the government has failed to answer one single question dealing with housing.

MR. FROST: I do not think you have been reading the answers, because I have filed a number of them myself. The hon. member (Mr. Temple) should sit up at night, and read these answers.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, before the Order is called; I think it is quite unfortunate, but we are really reasonable men on this side of the House.

MR. FROST: Since when?

MR. OLIVER: I am prepared to agree there are some questions which would entail a terrific lot of details.

MR. FROST: And should not be asked.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, I think I will even go that far. But the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in the sphere we are discussing now, should agree there are many questions on the Order Paper, and which have been there practically from the commencement of the Session, the answers to which the hon. members should have access.

For instance, consider question No. 134:

"What were the expenditures for maintenance on provincial highways, by highway districts,

for the years 1942 to 1950 inclusive?"

Surely that is a reasonable request for information, and it would be information which should be available for the hon. members, and it should be in the public interest.

The next question, No. 142, is just as reasonable, in respect to debenture purchases made by the Ontario Municipal Improvement Corporation since its inception, and asking,

"What is the total face value of the debentures purchased, from what municipalities, for what purpose, and for what amounts."

Surely that is a reasonable question.

MR. FROST: The answer to that was given in the Budget Address. There is a schedule, which does not show the infinite details of it, but it gives details, and that should be sufficient.

MR. OLIVER: In order to get answers to reasonable questions, such as are asked by the Liberals, --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. OLIVER: Surely there could be consultation between all groups and an agreement arrived at, as to what would be reasonable to be answered in this Session.

MR. FROST: I would be glad to consult with the hon. members opposite, and go into a huddle with them, and pick up questions they consider to be reasonable ones, if they will cut out the dead wood, and let us have the reasonable questions. I will be very glad to consult

with you, and see what can be done.

I am very anxious to give the hon. members information concerning public matters; I think we have leaned over backward in doing that. We have done it to the fullest extent. It is quite obvious that the hon. members opposite could ask questions on every item in the Public Accounts, but it would be almost impossible to answer them.

The hon. members, I know, must recognize the difficulty of a situation such as that. If the hon. members opposite want to ask so many questions that the machinery of government is bogged down, they must abide by that. Anyone can sit down and take the reports tabled in this House, and ask questions arising from them to the extent it would require all of the time of our 13,000 employees for a considerable portion of the year.

Nevertheless, we want to give the hon. members of this House all the reasonable information that can be asked for from a big business concern. We have a concern here doing a quarter of a million dollars worth of business a year. To try and answer specific questions on a multiplicity of items might just over-burden the staff altogether. There are limits, beyond which they cannot go.

I have read over some of the questions asked by the great statesman, the hon. Leader of the Progressive Group (Mr. MacLeod) and his knowledge of lumbering, logging, the saw-mill industry, and so forth, is simply encyclopaedic. No man could ask those questions without a great knowledge of the affairs of the Department of Lands and Forests and of the Forestry industry, and I would wonder that he should

ask such detailed and profound questions. I have read them over, and the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) must see that it would take a great deal of time to answer them. I suggest the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) might run in one of the woodland ridings of this province--instead of the industrial riding of Bellwoods,-- where they are dealing with slabs, saw-dust, logs, and pulpwood.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): You realize you are "asking for it," now?

MR. FROST: Oh yes, that is all right.

MR. MACLEOD: I may say we have had quite a demonstration of self-righteousness this morning, because if you want to take half an hour to look at the shelves behind Mr. Speaker, and turn back to former years when the present hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) sat back in this row, and just look over the questions that stand in their names --

MR. DOUCETT: And never answered.

MR. MACLEOD: All right. If they were never answered, then, of course, the responsibility for that may rest n the shoulders of the hon. members on my right.

MR. FROST: They have a lot of sins to answer for.

MR. MACLEOD: I think it is rather in poor taste --

MR. DUNBAR: I was going to tell you, when you mentioned my name, that "confession is good for the soul". I was surprised when I read the question which I think was put on by the Whip, and I understand they do the same in all parties. I was really surprised that I was asking a question, because I did not know anything about it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: May I ask the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) if his party Whip is putting the question on the Order Paper?

MR. MACLEOD: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has risen in my estimation by this frank statement. I do not think there is any occasion for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to flay the Opposition group, because they have asked a lot of questions. I think it is the duty of the hon. members to ask questions, provided they are not frivolous. I do not know why you labour the point that there are not many trees in Bellwoods; there are some good saw logs there, enough to supply the saw-mill in Port Arthur for quite a while. I do not know what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was driving at when he was rubbing the salt into me here. I happen to receive a lot of enquiries on matters regarding the forests of Ontario from some trade unions of this province, which are very much concerned, and I, as a matter of courtesy, like the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) have never hesitated to put these request for information on the Order Paper. What is wrong about that? Are you suggesting that only the hon. members in this House should take an interest in the Department of Lands and Forests, or say that only the few hon. members who come from the forest country should take an interest? Surely, the forests of Ontario are the concern of all the people of Ontario, and I think we are rapidly approaching the time when a larger number of people will take a keener interest in the

Department, and when that time comes, perhaps it will be rather unconfortable for the present government of Ontario.

MR. FROST: Oh no. We are so far ahead --

MR. MACLEOD: I think, in the main, the government has not done so badly in answering questions. But there are some questions standing in my name which have nothing to do with lands and forests, and which have been on the Order Paper for a long time. You will notice question No. 34 has been there since the 2nd of February. Why do you not answer it?

MR. FROST: What is it?

MR. MACLEOD: Read it. There are other questions also. I think No. 144 is a question addressed to your Department, and I happen to know that the answer to that question has been in your office for the past two or three weeks, but you have not filed it. I was told by the Department they supplied you with the answer within three or four days after the question was asked. Why are you holding out on that? There is no other conclusion but that you did not file that information because you did not want me to have it when the Department of Lands and Forests' estimates were before the House.

MR. FROST: I worked all week end getting answers to questions and filing them days before the estimates of the Lands and Forests Department came up.

In order to give the hon. members an example, I have one here, and I must say that I think the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) must have sat up very late at

night to finish it. Question 146, with regard to budworms. It is No. 226:

"1. Has the Department of Lands and Forests made a survey of trees on Crosn lands affected by bud-worm.

2. What is the acreage affected.

3. If there has been no actual survey is there an estimate of Crown lands affected.

4. What is the estimated acreage affected.

5. What species does bud-worm attack.

6. What proportionately is the infestation of
   (a) black spruce,
   (b) balsam,
   (c) white spruce, and
   (d) jack pine.

7. What has been the average mortality of kill due to bud-worm in:
   (a) the Mississagi Forest Reserve,
   (b) District of Algoma,
   (c) District of Thunder Bay,
   (d) District of Kenora,
   (e) District of Rainy River,
   (f) District of Patricia, and
   (g) the Nipigon Forest Reserve.

8. What companies have made applications to salvage this timber?

9. What applications have been granted?

10. Has the Department of Lands and Forests made a study of bud-worm?

11. What does it estimate is the period between first attack and mortality in
    (a) white spruce,
    (b) balsam,
    (c) jack-pine.
12. Has the bud-worm reached epidemic proportions in the above districts?
13. When did it reach such proportions?
14. What acreage in each of the above districts has been affected by bud-worm in the epidemic stage?
15. Has the Department of Lands and Forests studied the relevance of bud-worm to fire hazard?
16. What is the percentage of loss from insects, fungus and other secondary factors after the bud-worm epidemic has run its course?
17. Do the studies of the Department of Lands and Forests on bud-worm agree with the reports of the Entomology Branch of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa?
18. What does the Department of Lands and Forests estimate is the annual forest loss:
    (a) from bud-worm and other kill,
    (b) from fire."

MR. MACLEOD: What is wrong with that?

MR. FROST: Solomon in all his glory would have an awful time to answer that. How could the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) devise that question as to how long it would take a bud-worm to kill a tree.

MR. MACLEOD: That question is on there in respect to information sought by one of the trade unions.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, no.

MR. MACLEOD: What are you jumping into this for? You had better be careful, because you are not getting enough questions about your Department.

I say that where the government feels that a questions is beyond the capacity of a Department to supply the answer, there is no reason why you should not consult the hon. member who asked the question, and explain that it involves too much work, before the information could be obtained in its entirety.

MR. FROST: That is what we are endeavoring to do now, but you see how difficult it is to satisfy the hon. member (Mr.MacLeod).

MR. MACLEOD: I do not think you are making any effort at all toward answering some of these questions.

Just before I sit down, may I call attention to a request by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) appearing on February 22nd of routine procedings. Will you look at page 22.

MR. FROST: I just happened to pick this up from my desk. It refers to the question from the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey)No.236.I have a memorandum here from the Assistant Deputy Minister of Highways, which says:

" The question asked by Mr. Harvey could mean that we would have to supply him with a list of all property purchased since these highways were assumed by the Province. It would also mean that we would have to list thecontractors who had worked on these highways at any time since the highways were taken over by the Province. As you are well aware, over the entire limit of the Trans-Canada Highway, this would be a tremendous job, and I doubt if it could be completed under six months.

Before proceeding with the answers to this question, would it be possible to have Mr. Harvey clarify the question, i.e., put a limit to the number of years about which he requires information? Or could it be tabled as a return at some later date? "

(PAGE A-30 follows)

Mr. Speaker, we have here 110 question still to answer, and there are litterally dozen of them like that. When the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) gets down to the point of counting the bud-worms in Northern Ontario, that is really something.

MR. JOLLIFFE: When did the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)get that notation?

MR. FROST: That notation was on my desk.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is the date of it?

MR. FROST: It is dated March 9th, and it took six months to answer the question.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I want to make a suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) --

MR. MACLEOD: The floor has been taken from me.

MR. FROST: Let me conciliate. May I ask the hon. members opposite if this will meet with their approval --

MR. MACLEOD: What do we do now?

MR. FROST: If we take the suggestion of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) --

MR. OLIVER: I did not suggest anything. I do not see much use in so meeting. We would like to meet with the hon. member, and let him point out what is wrong --

MR. MACLEOD: You were doing that.

MR. OLIVER: If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) does not want to take the responsibility of answering these questions, the great proportion of which are reasonable, I would rather the responsibility be his, rather than mine.

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed a situation to develop which is completely out of order, and I call for

the Orders of the Day. The question was raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), and was answered by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), the Leader of the Government, but in the meantime everybody seems to have all sorts of ideas. I do not think it is a question of privilege, and even if it were, I was not notified, and I could easily have cut off the discussion immediately, because, as I think every hon. member knows, if any question is to be raised before the Orders of the Day, the Speaker must be made acquainted with it.

However, this being the last day, as this is a vital question, I believe I have allowed a great deal of indulgence, but I must now call the Orders of the Day.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which affects the rules, traditions and customs of this House, and I respectfully submit that it is a proper subject for discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: If it is the pleasure of the House that the House be adjourned in order to have a free and frank discussion on this, I must be governed accordingly, but I think I have allowed plenty of lee-way, and may I refer again to the fact that I was not notified of the intention to bring this matter up. I am not minimizing the importance of it. But it is completely out of order. I do not want to cramp the debate at all, but we must get on with the business of the House. We have had 50 minutes of it, and I do not know that we have approached any near to a solution. Let us now confine ourselves to the business of the House.

Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister). Order No. 29.

THE INCOME TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-ninth Order, second reading of Bill No. 160, "An Act to suspend The Income Tax Act (Ontario) in respect of income of the calendar year 1950", Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 160, "An Act to suspend the Income Tax Act, Ontario, in respect of income of the calendar year 1950".

Before the question is put may I say that I gave an explanation of the Bill on its introduction yesterday. If there is further information I would be very glad to give it, but I think I have answered any question that might arise.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 30.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirtieth Order, second reading of Bill No. 161, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act", Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 161.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, there is no provision for the inclusion of a representative of organized labor. It is true, there was a provision for a woman --

MR. FROST: There is no provision in this Bill

for any particular class, women, or municipal associations, or anything of the sort. It provides for the appointment of nine people. I, yesterday, gave the assurance that it was our intention to include on the Advisory Board a woman, and the representatives of two great municipal associations, which means that for the first time in the history of this province, the two municipal associations will have a very definite and positive official link with Hydro, and for the first time in history -- as another"first" for this government -- we will have a woman associated with this great Hydro undertaking, which is of such a great service to the women of this province.

As regards the balance;' each will make representations abroad, and that will make it representative territorially, and give representation to the various elements of our population, insofar as we can, with nine members. Beyond that I would not want to make any commitment.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Speaker, that is just the point. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) went out of his way to make clear that there will be a woman included, and two representatives from the two municipal electric associations, with which I agree fully. But I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should also go out of his way to mention one other specific representative on the Advisory Council, and that should be a representative of the organized labor movement in the province. They represent perhaps a quarter of a million or more of the organized citizens who, with their families, constitute a very important section of the population. They have a special economic and

social interest in the Hydro, and they represent a point of view which I do not think could be duplicated by any of the others, and I suggest that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should agree, even if not included in the Bill, to state to this House that he will, when appointing the Commission, make room for at least one representative, who will be recommended to him by the two main organized labor movements in the province of Ontario.

MR. FROST: I will take that into consideration. I am sure I will satisfy the hon. members of the House.

MR. MACLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I am curious to know just what bearing this legislation has, if any, on the legislation which was introduced into this House on March 26th, 1947?

MR. FROST: I may say to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) it has no relation whatever. I looked at the legislation of 1947, and they are empowered to enlarge the Board up to nine members. I did not intend to use that at the present time. I am not saying it might not be used later, and we certainly intend to go ahead, providing the House empowers me, with the Advisory Committee. This is a very necessary Preliminary to anything we might be considering in connection with Hydro. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod) that there is no relationship whatever.

MR. MACLEOD: The only reason I asked that question, was as I listened to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the other day, when he introduced this Bill for first reading, I thought I was listening to the very same kind of speech which Mr. Drew made in this House on the 26th of March,

1947, which provided for a somewhat similar appointment to the Commission itself, because when Mr. Drew introduced that amendment in 1947, he pointed out that it would make possible appointments to the Commission, of representatives of the Ontario Municipal Electric Association, labor, agriculture, housewives, Northern Ontario, and so forth, and he took up two or three pages of Hansard describing the wonders and glories of this amendment, he was moving to the Power Commission Act.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

A lot of time has passed. Nothing has been done about that. I am really wondering if anything is going to be done about it. I wonder if it is not also just a piece of window dressing.

MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), he is like Thomas, the Doubter; he is always full of doubts.

If the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) is in doubt about the progressive measure of this government, I ask the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) to look about, see the order paper, and see what has been accomplished this year in the line of legislation. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) knows he has here a government of action which is doing something.

MR. MacLEOD: That is exactly what we heard in 1947.

I would like the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to listen to his predecessor for just a couple of minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: What this to do with this Bill?

MR. MacLEOD: Yes.

MR. FROST: I am quite familiar with what the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) is going to say. With parts I agree, and with parts I do not agree. As for myself, I may say that if I agree, I agree; if I disagree, I disagree. There are some things in that with which I disagree.

MR. MacLEOD: Might I ask the Hon. Prime Minister

(Mr. Frost) on what side he was when he sat alongside Mr. Drew in 1947, and thumped his desk when that speech was made? I recollect it very distinctly. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) supported that, and the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) says now he has read it over that he does not agree with it. I suggest Mr. Drew was pulling the wool over the eyes of Ontario.

MR. FROST: This is 1951. That was in 1947. Any hon. member who has not learned and gained experience in four years, should not be in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: For myself, I am quite prepared always to change my mind. If I find that there are polities and our course is wrong, certainly I would amend our course and I would make it in line with what is in the best interests of the people of this province, at any time. In following that, I am not diverting a great deal from the practice of one who used to be here a number of years ago -- Mr. Hepburn. I will alter my course if it is in the best interests of our four and a half million people.

MR. MacLEOD: Be sure you do not land in the same back yard as did Mr. Hepburn. He changed his mind so often --

MR. FROST: It is a pretty nice back yard.

MR. OLIVER: Or, not as good a back yard.

MR. MacLEOD: All I am saying is that we have

heard a very grandiose description of what was going to happen to the power commission back in 1947, and a very fulsome treatment of how all these people were going to be represented on The Hydro Commission. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) says that he does not agree with that. Why do you not bring in a motion now to repeal the Acts which were enacted in 1947? You keep them on the statute books. Some day they will be reading this to the House as an example of all the great things which this Government does, forgetting, and neglecting to say, nothing has been done to implement it.

I say again, this piece of legislation which is before the hon. members now is just a piece of window dressing to set the stage for the election which is coming some time in September or October.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Gray South): Mr. Speaker, let me say first that if we are going to have such a committee, and if it is to be representative of the broad interests of the province of Ontario, then certainly the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should consider that a farmer, or a representative of agriculture, should be included among the personnel.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. OLIVER: Because, as the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows, these lines run all over the province of Ontario, across farmlands, there has been a lot of controversy and I think a good deal of unfairness in regard to the treatment of the farmer by The Hydro

Commission. I would like to say that in my opinion, this is a piece of legislation which has been brought from out among the moth balls to serve a particular purpose at a particular time.

MR. MacLEOD: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: It is just arriving now, and it may well be an indication of a general election in the province. The government of the province in need of some bolstering, brings this out of the long ago and seeks to dress it up in modern dress and present it to the people of the province. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows full well that the result of the deliberations and the labours of an advisory committee will not be very great in toto. The real work will, after all, be done, and the decisions will be made, by The Hydro Electric Power Commission of the Province of Ontario. If the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) were as serious as he pretends to be in this particular regard, he would have made the appointments to The Hydro Electric Power Commission, where these nominees would be in a position to render valuable service to the Province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: This advisory committee will just be an appendix of the Commission, and the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows this. It is just window dressing the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) set for a particular purpose at a particular time.

MR. FROST: The hon. member for Gray South (Mr.

Oliver) is so completely wrong. Usually he is not as wrong as he is on this particular occasion. He is terribly, terribly wrong on this occasion.

MR. PORTER: Three thousand per cent.

MR. FROST: The hon. member for Gray South (Mr. Oliver) is about as wrong as his leader.

Let me say that actually I have given this matter a good deal of thought and attention. In looking over The Hydro Commission, the possibilities of extending the Commission, which deals with matters affecting the very life-blood of Ontario, I have looked at it from the standpoint of the extension of the Commission to something of the sort of a Board of Directors, such as one finds in some of our financial, banking and industrial firms. Those concerns have functioning executive committees which deal with particular phases of business. In looking this matter over, from the standpoint of extending the Commission, itself, I have felt that perhaps the scheme as commenced was not clear enough to do that. On the other hand, I am bound to say that I feel it is in the interests of the people that the Commission should be a good deal broader than the present three-man type of Commission.

I might point out to the hon. members opposite, that they, themselves, never saw fit to provide -- but I was going to say "monkeying with Hydro" because no political party or government in the history of this province ever interfered with Hydro the way they inter-

fered with it, but I will not go into that; I will stay on a different plane, a very high plane. I will not get down to the level of the politics of those days.

MR. MacLEOD: At least they appointed an engineer as Chairman.

MR. FROST: Pardon me?

MR. MacLEOD: I say at least they appointed an engineer as Chairman.

MR. DUNBAR: Are you going to fire him, also?

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in looking at the advisory committee angle of it, the advisory committee angle consists of only five members under the present statute. It seemed to me that was not wide enough to give the broad representation in Ontario we would need. Therefore, I am making this recommendation of nine members.

As regards the 1947 Statute, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) may know, that Statute has never been proclaimed. It is part of the Statute, but not proclaimed as such. It is not my intention to proclaim that Statute; it is my intention --

MR. MacLEOD: Was it ever the intention of the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to proclaim it?

MR. FROST: I am looking at Hydro from this standpoint; we have a system which has grown up from a handful of municipalities in the Kitchener area. Some of the citizens of Kitchener were the founders of that system, and demonstrated their foresight

forty-five or fifty years ago. It has grown to a tremendous organization; covering virtually all of the recognized municipalities in Ontario. I think we have to look at it from the standpoint of having perhaps a broader approach to the problem of the people, and from the standpoint of the Commission. I think this is the safest and the wisest course to take, to provide for a sound, new approach to this great problem.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I believe that for some time the Hydro Electric Act has provided for this advisory council, but, as the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said, it was never appointed. When I asked that question, I thought perhaps there was a council operating about which the public did not know anything, and I am wondering now --

MR. FROST: Might I sincerely apologize to the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison)? I did not read his question, by some impossible chance. I did not know the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) had asked it until to-day.

MR. DENNISON: It seems to me that although the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is now changing that five-man council to a nine-man or woman council, and although he has promised to give representation to agriculture, to the O.M.E.A., and the other electrical association, I think the consumers, the large urban consumers, should have representation on the council.

I think the Commission and the council would benefit by continuing throughout the summer the special committees set up by this Legislature, which already have had two meetings with The Hydro Commission. Yesterday the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) suggested that to-day he might have something to say about the possibility of making that a select committee. I would like to point out to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that there is also the matter of The Ontario Northland Railway. I think it is a splendid idea to have a Committee of the House given the authority to meet in between Sessions with these public commissions and become better acquainted with the functions of them. I think it will also cut down the time of Debate in this House at the next Session.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Government notices and motions. Order No. 17.

I beg to inform the House that the Hon, the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject-matter of this resolution, recommends it

for the consideration of the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 17th Order; Mr. Dunbar -- Resolution -- that this House will resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering the following resolution:

"Resolved,

that (a) the salaries or other remuneration of the members of the Greater Toronto Assessment Board and its staff and all expenses of the Board shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund;

(b) each member of a Court of Revision constituted under Section 16 shall be paid such sum for his services as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may determine, and the payment of all members of such Courts of Revision shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund,

as provided by Bill No. 153, An Act to Provide for Uniformity of Assessment in Greater Toronto."

Resolution agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 18.

THE FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 18th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 116, An Act to Amend the Farm Products Marketing Act. Mr. Kennedy.

On Bill 116.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

MR. MILLARD: May I ask the Hon. Minister (Mr. Kennedy) if the changes which were agreed to in Committee have been incorporated?

MR. KENNEDY: Yes; they are all in here.

Sections 3 to 6 agreed to.

Bill No. 116 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.19.

THE COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 19th Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 155, An Act to Amend The Companies Act. Mr. Porter.

On Bill 155.

Section 1 agreed to.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, one question; this amendment to The Companies Act which is really a companion to the amended Insurance Act, presumably is required because of the difficulties involved in winding up an insurance company. In respect of what company did the difficulties arise?

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I think it was the Home Insurance Company, or some such name. I think the winding up took place in Alberta, or one of the western provinces. As it happened,in that case, they were no longer active in Ontario at the time and really no losses were suffered by Ontario policy holders; on the other hand, I think it did give rise to the problems this

Act is supposed to assist in solving. This will eventually become uniform legislation.

MR. WISMER: Have any of the other provinces passed this?

MR. PORTER: I believe it has been passed in all but one of the other provinces.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill No.155 reported.

- - - - - - -

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.20.

THE PHARMACY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 20th Order, House in Committee on Bill No.156, An Act to Amend the Pharmacy Act. Mr. Phillips.

On Bill 156.

Sections 1 to 4, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 156 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.21.

THE VOTERS LISTS ACT, 1951

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 21st Order; the House in Committee on Bill No. 109, The Voters' Lists Act, 1951. Mr. Porter.

On Bill No.109.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT: (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if you would mind going a little slower. I am a member of the Committee which revised this Act.

I have my notes in respect of the Bill in front of me. I would like to see they are correct, as we go along. I have to check both the notes and the copy of the Bill.

Section 8 agreed to.

On Section 9.

MR. W. DENNISON (St.David): Mr. Chairman, on Section 9, I believe this changes the number of copies of Municipal Voters Lists, from two to one given to members of the Legislature, and so on. Am I right that the section changes the number of copies given to the members from two copies to one? I would like to suggest that this practice continue of giving two copies to members of the Legislature, members of the House of Commons, and to the political parties in the district concerned. I do not know whether this is done in outside municipalities, but in the city the clerk gives two copies to each member of the Legislature, to each member of the House of Commons, and to the head office of each political party. Those city voters' lists are extremely handy. I know, as member for St. David, I am always asked by my local banks and various organizations if these lists can be borrowed at times. I do not know whether other hon. members have the same request, or not. My two copies are very, very useful. I would suggest that it remain the same.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): I am sure that if any hon. member of the Legislature requests

an additional copy, there will be no difficulty in getting it.

But there are a great many hon. members of the Legislature who will never require two copies, and it is felt that, under the present Act, is included, in addition to hon. members of the Legislature, as I recollect it, defeated candidates, and a large number of people, many of whom might not use it at all. This was a practical way of saving the municipalities this much expense. If any hon. member wants more than one copy, I am sure he would not have the slightest copy in securing it.

MR. DENNISON: The change is made in the original bill so that the hon. members concerned will not have to write before July 1st to get the one copy?

MR. PORTER: Yes, that is right. It was amended in Committee to that effect. I believe we owe that to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett).

Sections 9 to 16, inclusive, agreed to.

On Section 17.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, on Section 17, I notice sub-section 3 provides a penalty for non-attendance.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) may also thank the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) for deleting the penalty. The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) is a very broad-minded man, with human sympathy.

Sections 17 to 62, inclusive, agreed to.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, on Section 58 there is a form at the back which goes with Section 58. It is on Page 46 of the original copy of the bill. It is form No.23.

This form is the oath of the enumerator who makes up the Voters' Lists. The enumerator is asked to swear that "I will act faithfully in my capacity as enumerator without partiality, fear, favour, or affection, and in every respect according to the law, so help me God." It does not say anything about getting all the names, on the list. I wondered if that is covered in another --

HON. DANA PORTER (Prime Minister): I would say that is really an absurd suggestion. If you were to ask an enumerator, who has been sworn in, before he goes out, to swear that he will get all the names on the list, I do not imagine there is any single enumerator in the province of Ontario who, in an urban subdivision, has all the names on the list. There are bound to be some which are missed in one way or another. That is imposing an obligation and imposing something upon the conscience of the poor man which I am sure the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) does not seriously put forward.

MR. DENNISON: We might leave out the word "all", but we could say "all the names on the Voters' Lists to the best of his ability". It seems we swear him

on everything else except the one job he is to do.

MR. PORTER: He swears to do his job according to the law. The law says that he shall exercise utmost care in preparation of the Voters' Lists and so on. If he swears that that is what he is going to do, what more can you expect a man to take and swear/ to under cath? How can you expect him to do more than that? You do not wish to have all these people injured before they start.

MR. DENNISON: I accept the assurance of the Attorney-General. I was trying to prevent him from having difficulties in his own riding, --

MR. PORTER: I thought perhaps the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) was just joking.

Sections 63 to 109, inclusive, agreed to.

MR. H. G. NIXON (Brant): Might I ask the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) if the provision for vouching for names in rural areas is left --

MR. PORTER: Just as it was.

Sections 110 and 111 agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill No. 109 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.22.

THE ELECTION ACT, 1951

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 22nd Order, House in Committee on Bill No.110, The Election Act, 1951. Mr. Porter.

On Bill No.110.

Sections 1 to 15, inclusive, agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that this Act involves 200 sections. There are a very great many of these sections about which there is no difference of opinion whatever. Might it not be well to do, as we have done in some other cases with respect to very bulky acts such as this, and come down to the point where there may be questions which are required, that the Chairman call the pages?

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Are we violating any rules of the House if we do that?

MR. FROST: No. We did that in The Mining Act, one time.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): And in respect of The Division Courts Act.

MR. FROST: I think if the Chairman would call off the page, then he could take the sections, as agreed to, if there are not any questions asked.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes. I do not think it should be done without the consent of the House. I, personally, have no objection.

MR. PORTER: That is quite right.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Asfar as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, there are 68 pages in this Bill. The matter has been gone over carefully in Committee with all groups on that committee. Take the whole thing as read.

MR. PORTER: Perhaps we could ask if any hon. members have noted any particular questions with

respect to this Bill which he would like to raise -- there may not be any.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): It is quite meaningless, the way we are doing it now.

MR. PORTER: I would be quite prepared to move that the bill be reported in its present form and if any hon. member wishes to raise some question on that motion, we could deal with it, and, if the House approves unanimously, it could be dealt with in that way.

I make that motion, Mr. Chairman; I move that the bill be reported.

MR. JOLLIFFE: On that motion, I was a member of the Committee, with the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter), the hon. member for South Cochrane (Mr. Grummett) and other hon. members. Of course, prior to consideration by the Committee, we had an opportunity to study the new bill. A number of amendments were made, not as many in this bill as in the Voters' Lists Bill. Frankly, it took some time, of course, to reprint the bill as amended. I have not had an opportunity to examine the amendment. I would be quite prepared to accept the Hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter) assurance, if he has had time to go into the matter, that the amendments agreed upon duly appear in the bill as amended.

MR. PORTER: I might say that I am advised that the Legislative Council last night were in the Printers' Office and watched every page which went through in

order to expedite this matter. I think I can say that, with their assurance, the amendments which have been reported by the Committee are in this bill in the identical form. I cannot say that I have, personally, checked that. With their assurance--

MR. JOLLIFFE: All I am concerned about is to make sure someone has followed this thing through continuously. The Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has not had time. I have not had time. I do not suppose the Clerk of the House had time to follow it through from the beginning to the end.

MR. PORTER: If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is prepared to take the advice of the Legislative Council on that point, they have followed it through in the way I have mentioned, in a much closer fashion than in most bills, as a matter of fact. I think perhaps that might be sufficient.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think so.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I was going to suggest that, inasmuch as a number of hon. members of the House who were not members of the Committee, received representations from interested parties on Section 112, perhaps the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) might explain what happened there.

MR. PORTER: Very well. On Section 112:

Section 112 deals with the time off for voting. In the present Election Act, provision is made for time off for voting during the noon-hour and at a later time in the afternoon. That is accepted procedure which we

have had in the province with respect to provincial elections for some time. That has not always quite covered the case in some places. The amended bill, as introduced in this House, had a different provision for that section. On reading the amended provision which was submitted to this House, on first reading and considering that in the light of conditions, it was found it also had its defects.

(Take C follows.)

And now what was proposed in Committee as the result of some discussion which took place with representatives of various employers' groups who appeared at the meeting to make their representations. They were heard at some oength, and made some very effective representations in the matter.

What they proposed was simply this; that the section in the Dominion Election Act -- I believe it is section 37 -- makes full and adequate provision for time off during voting hours for the purpose of allowing employees to vote.

Speaking from recollection, as I have not the exact wording before me, -- oh, as a matter of fact, the exact words are in our Act. In Section 112, we find:

> "Every employee is a qualified voter shall, while the polls are open on polling day at an Ontario election, have three consecutive hours for the purpose of casting his vote."

It is true, that three hours -- which is the same as in the Federal Act -- is more than two hours in our Act, but the effect of it is a little different. For instance, if a man goes off at five o'clock, and the polls are open until seven, he has two hours of his own time, therefore, he would be entitled to one hour of his employer's time, to make it the three, which might be at the end of the day, the beginning of the day, or the middle of the day, according to his convenience or the operation of the company.

It was considered very simple, and the employers' representatives agreed that the three hours, under those conditions, was not unfair, that it worked very well, as it

had under the Dominion Act, but three hours is the maximum time which might have to be taken in some cases, but in most cases people are not on the job for anything like a continuous time between eight o'clock in the morning and seven o'clock at night; there is always time off, and in a vast number of cases, they are not working more than eight hours a day, so there is time in which every voter can cast his vote, and the provision is that it will not be more than three hours all told, and it may infringe, to a certain extent, on his employer's time.

MR. B.E. LEAVENS (Woodbine): May I ask a question of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter)? I presume the lunch hour is not included in that three hours?

MR. PORTER: This is a Dominion section, and there is no definite mention of the lunch hour there. With the three hours, it allows for great flexibility --

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is three consecutive hours?

MR. PORTER: Yes, three consecutive hours.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I just add this further word about what the hon. attorney general (Mr. Porter) has said. I think this is a wise change. We bring ourselves into conformity with the practice under the Dominion Act, and there will be much less confusion, subject to this, Mr. Chairman -- and I am just saying this because it might possibly lead to some small misunderstanding, although the provision is the same as the Dominion provision, the result might be slightly different, because under the Federal Act the polls close at six p.m., while under this Act they close at seven p.m., which I think is better.

It is possible in the practical application of the thing, it will lead to slightly different results. No harm need be done, but if some question arises as to why there is some slight variation between the two, that is the reason. That is not a reason for which we should apologize. And there would be less strain on the officials in the polling booths, and more opportunity for people to vote.

MR. SALSBERG: On this item --

MR. PORTER: I cannot hear a word.

MR. SALSBERG: Tell your colleagues to keep quiet, and you can hear me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. PORTER: I have no control over them.

MR. SALSBERG: I think this is an improvement over the previous Act, but I do not think it is good enough.

MR. DOUCETT: Oh no, we have to go further.

MR. SALSBERG: We have to insist that you go further, because you do not move very fast or very far; you only move by inches, and unless we prod you, you will note move at all.

It is not good enough, and I will illustrate that by cases which I think will convince the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that it is not good enough.

It would be very good, if the law would stop short and say that every employer must give three consecutive hours to his employees, so that they may vote -- period. But when you take into account the two hours after the regular working hours, you only have one hour for the employee, and you will have instances where hardships will continue to be felt.

Take, as an example, a worker employed in Malton, in the Aircraft Plant there. Many workers there live in Woodbine, or the Riverdale constituency, and it usually takes those people close to two hours to get home, and being tired from the day's work, and after a long trip home, they will have to stand in line before they can vote. Experiences have shown that in the working class districts, lines are usually formed after working hours, when the men come with their dinner pails, and there is a big rush in the polling booth, and invariably the line forms. A man working in Malton and reaching Woodbine after about two hours travel, finds he has to stand in line for an hour before he can vote. I think if we had a limited section to provide for three hours consecutively, and not take into account the hours between the regular working hours and the time of voting, we would have provided much more protection to many industrial workers who otherwise are deprived of the right to vote.

I recall a number of instances where workers formed a line of 70 outside the polling booth, and the door was closed at seven o'clock, and they were told it was too late. That was due to the fact that they all had to come at the same time, but the line was so long that at seven o'clock there were still 70 voters outside, who could not get in to vote. I would suggest they be given three consecutive hours, and not take into account the time which may lapse between the regular working hours and seven o'clock.

MR. PORTER: That would give a great many people

five hours. Surely it is necessary to limit this somewhere.

MR. SALSBERG: Three consecutive working hours.

MR. PORTER: Supposing a man comes off his job at noon; surely he should not be entitled to three hours off his working time.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, I might compromise.

MR. PORTER: If the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is willing to compromise, all right.

This Bill, as far as it can, covers all the problems we get throughout the province. We think it is very much better than the present Act, because the present Act only allows two hours, and this gives three. There are in this Act three consecutive hours in the day, during which a man can cast his vote. I think there would be but a few isolated cases where they would not get an opportunity to vote. On the other hand, I think we have done the best we can, being reasonable with all parties concerned, to give as fair an opportunity as can be given to all the citizens of this province. There are always a few, who, for some reason or another, cannot get to the polls.

There is another great advantage about it. It is the same as the Federal Act, to which people have become accustomed, and are not so likely to become confused. There is a great deal to be said about having something that is similar to a Federal Act, because it results in less confusion; people become accustomed to one thing, and it makes it easier all around.

MR. FROST: I know that the hon. members are as

concerned with this matter as we are. In this Act we are making provision which fits across this province, with all its varied conditions, and a great variety of hours of work. In some places they work on two shifts; in some places, on three. Of course, under this section, there may be cases where there would be no time necessary to be taken from work at all. On the other hand, no doubt there will be many cases where the entire three hours will come out of the period of work. There are all sorts of conditions we have to meet, and we cannot make it even across the Board. We must devise the best system we can to meet conditions which apply far and wide across the province.

MR. SALSBERG: I would like to say a word on section 165.

MR. MACLEOD: Is there anything improper about it? That was the arrangement. The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) moved that the Bill be reported, but all hon. members have a right --

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. PORTER: That has turned out to be very satisfactory way of dealing with these things.

MR. SALSBERG: Section 165 deals with the corrupt practices during an election. I would appreciate the opinion of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) on whether subsection "G" of that section, or any other provision, would cover corrupted practices of the following kind:

Let us consider the hypothetical case of a candidate having his committee room and election office in a certain

place, and after the election, he finds these headquarters or offices or committee rooms have been transformed into some establishment which requires a provincial licence; would you say that indicates a "corrupt practice"? In my opinion, it would indicate that. I wonder whether that section would cover it.

MR. PORTER: Since the hon. member has a definite opinion about the matter, surely he is not concerned with mine.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, do not be so touchy. I appreciate your opinion, and am anxious to get it.

MR. PORTER: It is out of the question to give an opinion on a hypothetical statement of that kind. I am not prepared to give an opinion as to whether this section would apply or not. Unless I had an opportunity of examining all the facts relating to any actual case, I would not be able to give an opinion.

MR. SALSBERG: May I be a bit more specific, in order to help the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter). If, for instance, a candidate has a number of committee rooms, and immediately after the election, they are transformed into taverns, and lounges, would you say that was a corrupt practice; that there was something which justified the conclusion that there was a "corrupt practice" there somewhere.

MR. PORTER: I do not know whether it is or not. It all depends. I do not know whether it would come under that section or not. I do not know what relation there may be between hypothetical taverns, and hypothetical dining rooms, and hypothetical candidates, and hypothetical agencies. I

April 4

have not the facts.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not as hypothetical as the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) makes it out. The taverns are very real --

MR. PORTER: Does the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) have any specific example of where that happened?

MR. SALSBERG: Would that help the hon. Attorney Genral (Mr. Porter)?

MR. PORTER: Yes, very much.

MR. FROST: Let me give the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) an example --

MR. SALSBERG: A hypothetical one or a real one?

MR. FROST: It is real. I do not deal with hypothetical subjects. At one time I had a place for a Progressive Conservative Committee room, which I think is a pretty high object. There was a civic election almost immediately after, and the same premises were used for a liberal committee room --

MR. PORTER:,That is certainly a corrupt practice.

MR. McEWING (Wellington North): They were just trying to clean it up.

MR. BROWN (Waterloo North): Very commendable.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not believe that would be a corrupt practice. It may be an improvement. I hate to say that, from my knowledge of some of the things the liberals do.

MR. PORTER: Tell me what case it is?

MR. SALSBERG: I can say it --

MR. PORTER: Just be brief, rather than continuing your speech.

MR. SALSBERG: When the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter)

is in Court, he does not have to have exhibits (a), (b), and (c) to draw a conclusion.

MR. PORTER: I certainly do.

MR. SALSBERG: Then you are a bad lawyer. If the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Temple) had a Committee room which was subsequently turned into a tavern after the election, that would not be "corrupt"; that would be a coincidence.

MR. PORTER: It would be highly improbable if a Conservative candidate had a committee room which was subsequently turned into a tavern immediately after an election, that would not be considered a "corrupt practice"? I never heard of such a case.

MR. SALSBERG: You never heard of such a case?

MR. PORTER: I never did. It would be improbable.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) says it would be quite improbable. If a Conservaite candidate should have a committee room and immediately after the election, it blossomed forth into a beverage room -- I will show in good time the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) that such an "improbability" is a very, very concrete fact. I consider it corrupt practice, and I wonder if this section would take care of such a hypothetical case.

MR. PORTER: I am very much surprised that the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) has kept this as a surprise all these years Whether this happened at the last election, or the one before, or the one before that, the election with which he was concerned himself --

MR. SALSBERG: It could be anyone in this House.

MR. PORTER: He says he has specific cases, he

keeps them secreted in his breast; he believes it is corrupt practice; he believes it is an infraction of the law, did not say one word to the others; he keeps silent; he waits all this time, and has informed nobody about this situation, and he only comes now to give us that information.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) should try not to become so melodramatic. I assure him I did not keep it locked in my heart; I did not keep it secret; I did not --

MR. PORTER: You never complained.

MR. SALSBERG: I did not say that the record will show that it was a criminal offence, and on some occasions actions should have been taken. I merely cited what I prefer to call a "hypothetical case" which, in my opinion, had taken place, and which constituted a "corrupt practice". I was merely asking the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) Whether this section to which he is referring would cover this corrupt practice in an election, and would make it possible to take some legal action on the basis of this Act. Thatis all I said. Whether it took place at all or not, in my constituency or in any other, whether it was in the last election, or in future is entirely irrelevant to the academic question we are discussing now, in the making of laws.

May I conclude by saying that after listening to the horrible tales which are now being unearthed in the United States I was just wondering if this covered any corruption in politics.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

and the involvement of politicians with gamblers, gangsters and others engaged in professions which are now lawful, it is not as academic a question as the hon. Attorney General Mr. Porter may think; and we should take heed of it, that questions, whether they be such as the one on the picture, are taken care of by this section. I assure the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) that such a case did take place. I did not keep it locked within my breast. Anytime his curiosity gets the better of him, I will tell him I am satisfied.

MR. PORTER: I am very glad to give the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) an opinion, when I get the facts.

MR. JOLLIFFE: A legal opinion.

MR. PORTER: A legal opinion.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think, Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole, and you, might like to have the latest score from the big-wig.

The official cost of living index for the month of February rose from 175.2 to 179.7, an increase of 4 1/2 points, which, I think, constitutes a new record.

Motion agreed to.

Bill No. 110 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 23.

THE ACTIVE SERVICE ELECTION ACT, 1951

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-third Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 134, "The Active Service Election Act, 1951", Mr. Porter.

D-2

On Bill No. 134.

On Section 1.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, if the government would agree I would move an amendment, but if they will not, there is no use going through the motions. I think it would be a great step forward if the government were to agree to amend this Act in order to extend the right to vote to all those 18 years of age and over in the armed services, to all young people in the province of 18 years and over. I think the recognition should be extended.

Hon. DANA PORTER.(Attorney General): That matter was debated in this House and the House has ordered on the principle involved in this proposed motion.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) would not accept the amending motion?

MR. PORTER: No.

Sections 1 to 7, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 134 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 24.

THE INSURANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth Order, House in Committee on bill No. 154, "An Act to amend The Insurance Act", Mr. Porter.

On Bill 154.

Sections 1 to 24, inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 154 reported.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

MR. DOUCETT: Order No. 25.

UNIFORMITY IN ASSESSMENT IN GREATER TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 25th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 153, "An Act to provide for uniformity of Assessment in Greater Toronto." Mr. Dunbar.

Sections 1 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 11:

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, Section 11 deals with the proclamation provisions of this Act. I have spoken on this intervention of the right of the municipal government, and I just want to say a word and make my position clear again now. It is one thing to argue for the need of section assessment, it is another thing to ask this Legislature to enact a law that will enable this government by proclamation to enforce an assessment which their assessing board will arrive at without the citizens of the municipality or their elected government having anything to say about it. I do not think that that extreme power should be sought by the province, and I do not think that extreme power should be granted by this Legislature. I therefore move that Section 11 be deleted.

Hon. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Seconded by whom?

MR. SALSBERG: You do not need a seconder, in committee, Mr. Minister Of Highways (Mr. Dcouettt). I learned that lesson.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Wouldn't he second it for you?

MR. SALSBERG: No, he won't.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr.

Chairman, I would like to explain in a few words that if this is deleted, the whole Bill is killed, because if the Municipal Board decide on amalgamation, or say that dertain municipalities are going to be amalgamated under certain conditions, we have got to have the power-- that is, the Board has-- on instructions from the Municipal Board, upon proclamation, that certain assessment will take effect in that municipality. If this is deleted, the whole Bill is gone.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what I want to avoid, namely the power of the Municipal Board or this government to force through amalgamation without the consent of the municipalities and contrary to their wishes. I think amalgamati n--

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: This, Mr. Chairman, is in reply to the statement of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). Amalgamatin is a problem that we must try to solve in a reasonable, negotiated manner, and not by the use of the shotgun which this section provides. I am quite conscious of the effect of the deletion of this section, but nevertheless, move the amendment.

MR. DUNBAR: The property owner in any municipality where a proclamation might be made is not deprived of any right to appeal to the Court of Revision, to the county judge or the Municipal Board. So we are taking no right away from them at all.

MR. SALSBERG: You are taking away the rights, Mr. Chairman, of the Municipalities as organized municipalities, and the rights of the municipal representatives democratically elected to represent citizens of a municipality.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: The questi n, the question.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Before you go on,

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would go back to section 5. I am sorry I passed it. I was talking to the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) at the time.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, of course.

MR. OLIVER: It would seem to me that in section 5,

> "Every area municipality shall place the services of its assessment commissioner and assessors and of the staff of its assessment depart ment at the disposal of the Board to assist the Board----"

and so on; does not the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) think there is a danger of disrupting the assessment department, for instance in this case of the city of Toronto? Is that not going a little too far? I would like to hear the hon. Minister's (Mr. Dunbar) comment on that.

MR. DUNBAR: Do you not think subsection 2 explains that? It says:

> "Where the Board requires assistance from a municipality under subsection 1 to an extent that interferes with the proper carrying out of the duties of an assessment department, the Board shall supply from its staff such assistance as may be necessary for the proper carrying out of such duties."

Therefore, if we did require the assistance of some men from the municiplaity and they say: "Well, now, we require these men at this particular time," we will pay for the substitutes, for any person to replace them.

MR. OLIVER: I see.

Sections 11 to 24 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 153 reported.

MR. DOUCETTS Order No. 26.

STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 26th order, House in Committee on Bill No. 157, "The Stat ute Law Amendment Act, 1951." Mr. Porter.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anything very unusual about these amendments, but one not an expert might not grasp the full significance. Would the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) just give us the assurance that there is no amendment here of any real importance that ought to be considered in detail.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Well, I would say that I did mention on second reading that there was an amendment to the Milk Control Act. I think the hon. member (Mr. Calder) was present on that occasion. These other amendments wer minor amendments that have come to our attention at a late stage. They are not amendments really in principle at all, I do not think.

MR. CALDER: Thank you.

MR. PORTER: I may say that I have one further amendment I wanted to introduce when we get down to the end of this Bill, which I will explain.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, my, my. To tidy up the tidying?

Sections 1 to 6 inclusive agreed to.

On section 7.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): On 7, Mr. Chairman, I have a letter today from the Housewives Consumers Organization. It is a copy of the letter sent to the hon. Leslie M. Frost, Prime Minister of Ontario, complaining that the Milk Control Board, or the Milk Control Amendment we passed has not held the price of milk, and drawing the attenti n of hon. members of the Legislature to the drop in the consumption of

milk in this area. I would like to quote the following:

> "In the Autumn of 1948, Doctor L. B. Pett, Domini n nutritionist, warned that the per capita milk consumption figures in Canada were 40 to 50% below the desired level for the maintenance of health. Doctor McHenry, Professof of Public Health and Nutrition at the University of Toronto, said on Ap il 5th, 1950, that 40% of the children of Toronto are not getting enough milk to drink. In June of last year Toronto people drank 100,000 quarts less than in 1949 ."

These people are complaining about the standard milk, but since that letter was written the operators have taken advantage of the situation to raise the price of skim milk. It seems funny that the legislation we passed the other day does not have a definition which would stop that. If that is the case, I think we should make it very clear that the definition of milk should include skim milk, and I would not have any objection to it including chocolate milk and cream prices along with it .

A man told me this morning in my constituency that for some time his family, because of their budget, have had to switch to skim milk, which they can buy at a good many cents cheaper.

MR. PORTER: Much better for you, too. People are crazy not to buy it.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is only in St. George's.

MR. DENNISON: Approximately half the price, and we are told it contains all the ingredients in whole milk except the fat. This man complained that he went to the store yesterday and found the price was up two cents, and he complained and

the storekeeper told him that the dairy had informed him that that was not controlled.

I am glad to see the government is introducing this amendment to stop the "jacking up" of the wholesale price for the local stores who are attempting to give consumers milk at a little less, but I would suggest that this section number 7 perhaps be sent back for redrafting to include a tightening up of these other two points.

MISS AGNES MacPHAIL (York East): Tighten them up here.

MR. DENNISON: Then may I move that this section B---what shall we say---referred back to the Agriculture Committee for redrafting.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): May I point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) that the Bill covers all of those things, that the Milk Control Act and the amendments here of this Session, and this section here, include those. That is our view on it.

MR. DENNISON: Including skim milk and chocolate milk?

MR. FROST: That is right. It has the broadest definition.

MR. PORTER:

> "Milk includes cream and such products of milk or cream as are manufactured or processed in any form other than butter and cheese."

Milk is milk, and it includes all these other things as well. That seems to me to be a pretty broad definition.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Is the defect, then, in the Board's order that it only covered whole milk?

MR. FROST: May I inform my hon. friend (Mr. Park) that undoubtedly there are going to be efforts to test various angles of this control Bill. There is no doubt about that.

My hon. friend the member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) well knows that the legislation passed in this House was not for the purposes of setting a price, an unalterable price for milk in this area. That was not the purpose of it. The purpose of the provision passage here was to make it that the distributors, who are a small select group, would not have the fixing of the price, that they could not alter or raise the ceiling price which obtains in the areas as of the 30th of March, was it, or at any rate, the date in March that applied, they could not alter that unless with the approval of the Board, That is the purpose of the legislation.

In the Act which was passed here in the House a few days ago, the expression "prices" was used, and we were of the opinion, and are still of the opinion, that it covered the wholesale price of milk as well as the retail price. We have noticed that there are attempts to get "under the wire" in that regard, and we are taking this opportunity of clarifying it so that it does include the wholesale price as well as the retail price.

I do not know that you could get anything broader than that. It is milk or cream or anything else except the two exceptions which I mentioned in the section. I think that certainly means everything. I think that the Board and the judge will have to get their administrative experience in this thing, there is no doubt that there will be attempts to circumvent and to evade the regulations. We think this is wide enough to include everything. Surely if the English language means anything, it is wide enough. I do not know where one could strengthen it. In the operation of the Board, I think that the Board's orders and the regulations which will be made to assist the Board from time to time should

certainly clarify the situation. Undoubtedly there is going to be a period when there is perhaps going to be some misunderstanding which will have to be cleared up, but it would seem to me this would come up in the administration of this Act and in the regulations that will be passed from time to time.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I might point out to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that within the last couple of days cream has gone up to the restaurant owners of the city, and a pretty fair jolt too. I understand that they are pretty well perturbed about it, because they are tryihg to keep the price of coffee down, and cereal cream is used particularly in coffee. They are trying to keep coffee within the ten cent limit and in some places two for fifteen, but this last jolt has them worried, because coffee itself has been gradually rising and after the figures released here by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), you can understand the perturbation they are in.

This has happened within the last two days, so apparently in their view, unless they have already applied to the Board, this Bill does not cover the wholesaling of milk products, according to them.

MR. FROST: Well, it certainly would under this amendment.

MR. PARK: Can we ask this question of the government, then. The original Bill, the original Milk Control Bill, certainly covered milk and established the price as of a written date except when action was taken by the Milk Control Board, that is where the review was to be made by the Milk Control Board, Now in opposition to that legislation, which passed this House, certain prices of certain types of

milk products which are covered in the definition of milk---and I would agree they are covered in the definition as it was read out to us by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)---therefore it would seem to me to suggest that there is some good possibility that the increases announced other than in the whole milk field by the dairies in the Toronto area are in violation of the Act passed by this House. And now I come to the question: Is the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter) Department, or anyone else, prepared to take action based on that violation?

MR. FROST: I may say the whole matter is before the Board at the present time. Section 1 of The Milk Control Act, subsection K says:

> "Milk includes cream and such products of milk or cream as are manufactured or processed in any form other than butter or cheese."

Now, I ask hon. members of the House, what does that mean? The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has just made a suggestion here. We are adding this section, after a public hearing prescribed maximum prices at which milk as defined in the Act may be sold wholesale or retail in any market; now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has just suggested that if there is doubt in this matter, we are prepared to hold this subsection over until tomorrow. I cannot see that there is any reason why it could not be considered in the meantime---reconsidered---and if it does not include what we think it does, to strengthen the section so that it does--it appears it covers everything, but we are quite prepared to do that.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, if I may just ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), in respect to the answer he gave me about the Windsor situation.

at the time the Bill was introduced, as the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will remember. There has been an increase in the price of milk after the freeze date was put on by the Legislature, and at that time you suggested that the Board would go to Windsor and review that situation and if necessary that they would plough back an increase. So far there has been nothing done, and I would like to ask what action the Board will take, and when.

MR. FROST: I do not know what the Board has done in that regard.

MR. ELLIS: Have they been set to go to Windsor, have they been set to review the situation there at all, or what?

MR. FROST: What has happened in Windsor? Did the price go up?

MR. ELLIS: Yes, after the freeze date.

MR. FROST: Well, the intention of course was, in the Windsor situation as we understood it here, there has been an increase given to the milk producers which was reflected in an added cost to the consumers. We understood that, and at the time in the House here it was our view that the Act did not affect that particular situation. We took a certain date, I forget the date--it was midnight, I think, on the 14th of March--we took that as the time and our belief was that the price in Windsor in that particular instance had been increased and that that increase was not affected by the Act. That was our understanding of it here in the House when the Bill was passed.

Subsequently I was shown an advertisement which said that the increase in price did not become effective until the 16th of March, and I think that there might be some question

as to whether the Windsor situation did, in fact, come under the Legislation in this House. It was in connection with that, that I mentioned that the Board would look into the matter. We were not bringing in this legislation because of the Windsor situation in which a price increase was arranged, because of the low prices which were being paid to the producers in that area.

That was the situation, as I understand it. What has taken place since, I cannot say.

MR. ELLIS: I would say to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the actual fact is ---whether there has been an agreement to raise the price, I do not know, --- but I do know that the price increase did not go into effect in Windsor till the day after the freeze date on the Bill that was passed here in the House. The situation now is that the Windsor consumers pay the highest cost for a quart of milk in the province of Ontario.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, there is a question of some difficulty here. I know this, because I was a little confused about it myself earlier to-day. As I see it, what has happened is that the definition of milk, as it was given to us, and as it is found in the Act, includes associated products as well as whole milk. Now, if you apply that definition to Section 7 of the new amended Act which passed this House a week or so ago,

the result must be that without authority of an Order from the Board, the retailers cannot increase the price of either whole milk or an associated product. The onus is upon them to go and get such an order.

They, or some of them, are under the impression that while the price of whole milk was frozen, they were still as free as the breeze with respect to other associated products in which, subject to the opinion of the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) I think they were mistaken.

MR. PORTER: Well, I think I did indicate a minute ago that we would be prepared to hold over this section until to-morrow. We feel that if there is any doubt about it, we should certainly examine it with great care, and if there is any further amendment required, we should introduce it. If that is satisfactory to the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe), I would move that this section be withheld and dealt with to-morrow.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think that is the right course.

MR. PORTER: Then, if that is satisfactory, that will be done.

Section 7 stands.

Sections 8 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

On Section 12.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I have another

amendment that I wish to introduce at this stage, a matter that has recently come to my attention. It is in connection with the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act, and it also relates to The Legislative Assembly Act. Under The Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act, there is a Board set up, which is appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and there is no payment to the members of that Board by the Crown. On the other hand, the members of the Board are, in a sense, representatives of the Embalmers and Funeral Directors Association, and that association provides for transportation, expenses and a nominal per diem indemnity when they are engaged in the work of this office. The question has arisen due to the fact that one of the members that was considered for appointment to this was the hon. member for Algoma East (Mr. Fullerton) who apparently was requested to take this by a very large majority of the various committees. I understand they were in entire agreement that they wanted him to act on this Board to help them.

Of course, the government would be very pleased to do that, but in view of the possible conflict with The Legislative Assembly Act, I think this matter is open to some doubt, and I would say that The Legislative Assembly Act was never intended to deal with this sort of thing. What The Legislative Assembly Act was intended to deal with was, I think, where a person is appointed by the Crown with a salary or emolument attached to the office, with the exceptions

that are contained in The Legislative Assembly Act, that they can accept certain types of commissions and one thing and another, that that is really what they were intending to do. However, the question is this, does it really apply to this sort of case, where a person who is a member of The Legislative Assembly, is appointed to a Board and he is entitled to expenses and a per diem allowance, not paid by the Crown or by the taxpayers at all in any way, but by the association that he is appointed to govern.

I think it is reasonable, and I think that under these circumstances it would be reasonable to permit a member of the Assembly to sit upon that sort of Board. I think the House will recall that this sort of thing has occurred in the past on some occasions, something a little bit similar, perhaps not quite similar. We passed a special act for one of the hon. members of the Opposition not long ago. We were very glad to be attached to that. It was quite the proper thing to do. This may not be exactly similar at all. This is quite a different type of activity, but this is apparently what the association involved in this wants, and I am therefore presenting this as an amendment to The Statutes Law Amendment Act. I will read the wording of it:

"Section 2 of The Embalmers and Funeral Directors Act is amended by adding thereto the following sub-section:

(4) notwithstanding anything in The Legis-

lative Assembly Act, the appointment of a member of the Board, if he is a member of the Assembly, shall not be avoided by reason of the payment to him or the acceptance by him of any per diem, travelling or living allowance under this Act, nor shall he thereby vacate or forfeit his seat or incur any of the penalties imposed by that Act for sitting and voting as a member of the Assembly;

2 This section shall come into force on the day it receives the Royal assent."

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the Hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) made reference to the particular case that involved an hon. member of the Opposition, (the) member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer). It similar to this, and I raise it again at this time. Last year when The Labour Relations Act was passed through this House, I raised the question whether the Province of Ontario ought not to follow the practice that is employed in the province of British Columbia. It is written in the Act there that members of the Legislature are not barred from acting, in effect, barred from acting, on Boards of Conciliation as they are in the Province of Ontario. The Government undertook last year to give consideration to that matter, and I had hoped that we might have some legislation on it this year. Now that the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) has brought this point down, I raise it again in the hope that, not now but perhaps in a subsequent Session, that amendments might come forward.

MR. PORTER: I think it is well worth considering. I think this is rather a difficult point. We do not want to go too far, and yet where to draw the line sometimes is difficult, and sometimes the best thing to do is to take the cases as they come along. If you open the door to this sort of thing too widely, so that some other government -- not this one of course --would appoint all of its members to some lucrative

post, that is the sort of thing --

MISS MacPHAIL: They need it.

MR. PORTER: Well, of course, I am sure they would be glad to have it, I have never met anybody who would not.

Amendment agreed to.

MR. FROST: Will you just hold that Bill then?

Section 12, formerly 11, agreed to.

Section 13, formerly 12, agreed to.

Section 14, formerly 13, agreed to.

Bill No.157 stands.

MR. FROST: Order No.27.

CHARITIES ACCOUNTING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 27th Order, House in Committee on Bill No.158, "An Act to Amend the Charities Accounting Act". Mr. Porter.

MR. PORTER: Sections 1 to 4 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 158 reported

MR. FROST: Order No.28.

OPTOMETRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 28th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 159, "An Act to Amend the Optometry Act". Mr. Phillips.

MR. W. DENNISON(St. David): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) could tell us if he has heard from anyone in opposition to this -- is it satisfactory now to vote?

HON. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Yes,

the thing is absolutely satisfactory to all groups.

Sections 1 to 7 inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 159 reported.

(Take F follows.)

F-1

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the permission of the House to consider in Committee the two Bills which were given second reading this afternoon, the Income Tax Act, and The Power Commission Act?

Thse Bills might be held over. We have to go back into Committee tomorrow, but there are quite simple, and we might consider them this afternoon.

SUSPENSION OF INCOME TAX

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: House in Committee on Bill No. 160, "An Act to suspend the Income Tax Act (Ontario) in respect of income of the calendar year, 1950", Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 160 reported.

THE POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: House in Committee on Bill No. 161, "An Act to amend The Power Commission Act", Mr. Frost.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 161 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7; Public Bills and Orders.

THE FACTORY SHOP AND OFFICE BUILDING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 92, "An Act to amend the Factory, Shop and Office Building Act", Mr. Gordon.

Sections 1 and 2 agreed to.

Bill No. 92 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain Bills, and progress on another Bill.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to repprt 13 Bills without amendments, begs leave to sit again, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order; second reading of Bill No. 39, "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act", Mr. McEwing.

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 39, "An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act".

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this Bill into the House, I have done so due to the fact that a new condition has arisen in the last year or two, and that is the advent of so many school buses traveling on our highways, following the high school areas, and other forms of education. It has become quite popular with so many children being transporte and a number of serious accidents have happened, one near my own community, where a child almost lost his life by passing in front of a school bus, when it had stopped.

We have very little control over the children; it seems hard to get them educated to realize the hazards

they are facing, and we have them running in front of cars every day, and if there is anything we can do to prevent the loss of life or the maiming any of our young people, we should do it.

This is a simple Bill, and it has stood on the Order Paper for a considerable time, and I think the public has had sufficient time to digest it, and there have been many favorable comments regarding the introduction of this Bill. I see where the Educational Association -- or a branch of it -- passed a resolution favoring the passing of the Bill, and I believe in other places of this Bill is similar to one that is in operation today.

The Bill says:

> " Every motor vehicle used for the transportation of pupils to and from a school, shall have the words 'School Bus' prominently displayed on the front or rear thereof, in bold-faced letters, not less than 8 inches in height, and in a colour that is in a contrast to the vehicle".

I think it was mentioned it would be difficult to describe the colour, but I think by having a "danger" sign, that might meet the situation. We have in our postal department something similar, with regard to the mail-delivery cars, which have signs on them displaying them "R.R. Mail car".

I think it will be very simple to put something of that kind on our school buses, and it would serve a very needed purpose.

As I said before, if there is anything we can do to save livos or prevent the maiming of our young children, I think it is up to the Legislature to do it.

We have had a number of very close calls. In fact, there have been some serious accidents, and I would ask the House in all seriousness to approve of this Bill as it is before us today.

MR. T.H. ISLEY (Waterloo South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word on Bill No. 39. I think this is a sensible request, to ask that buses be marked or traffic should be stopped when a bus is stopped to take on or discharge passengers. I can say, as one who lives on a highway, that children have the habit of coming around behind the buses and running out into the roadway, and I probably have a strong feeling in this matter, because I almost lost my boy; if it had not been that the car driver took to the ditch, my boy probably would have been struck. I am sure on highways where there is heavy traffic, a child has not much chance of getting across, unless the traffic stops.

In the city, they have traffic lights where a child coming to an intersection can stop and wait for the light to change, and then go across and is well protected. But in the country, on our busy highways, they do not have that protection, and I have seen children standing from five to ten minutes waiting for a break in the traffic, and then rushing across the highway.

This legislation would not be new. Many of the States to the south of us have this type of legislation.

When I travelled with the Conservation Committee I saw several places where this was in effect, and it did not hold us back very many minutes on our journey, and I do not think we should be in so much of a hurry that we cannot stop and give consideration to our children alighting from these buses. I think it is sound legislation.

MR. D. BAXTER (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Speaker, I want to a few minutes to back up what has been said by the two hon. members preceding me, in regard to Bill 39.

In the legislation last year I suggested to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) that this was legislation which was quite necessary, and quite needful to protect the children who are going to school in buses in this province of Ontario.

Only recently I have received several cmments from people in this province who have made trips to the United States during the last few months, and have returned with the comment that the citizens of the United States seemed more concerned about the safety and welfare of their school children than we do here in Ontario.

Knowing the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is a very kindly and very consciencious man, I do not think he would stand in the way of any legislation which he felt would advance the safety conditions of children travelling on the school buses. The Ontario Safety League has been approached on this matter by a number of school Principals, and they have came back and told us it was feasible to have legislation of this kind. They have said they are running into difficulties with this legislation in the States and have tried to make it more workable.

But, in reply to that, I would just like to read briefly the legislation which exists in the 48 States of the Union to the south of us.

In 35 of the States vehicles approaching from any direction must stop for school buses loading or unloading pupils.

In 35 of the States that is the law. If any hon. member says he is "from Missouri" the State of Missouri is included in the list.

In five of the States vehicles approaching from any direction must stop for school buses loading or unloading pupils and may then pass at reasonable or prudent speeds but not in excess of ten miles an hour.

In four of the other States the vehicles must slow down.

In three of the States vehicles must come to a complete stop and then may proceed.

There is only one State which has no law on the subject in all the States in the Union, namely, the State of South Dakota.

It would seem that with the progress we have made in education, with the changes we have made in having high school areas in a consolidated set-up, all of which necessitates school buses to a very great degree where pupils have to travel considerable distances, it is high time that in the province of Ontario we took some definite steps in this matter. I know it has been brought up in this House on a previous occasion -- just a short while ago, as a matter of fact -- this would inflict some hardships on some schools which are just starting in with their systems of transportation.

The Department of Education, under its Rules and Regulations, and particularly in Circular B-1960, concerning the transportation of pupils to elementary and secondary schools, it is said:

> "Contracts should not be entered into or licences applied for in respect of motor vehicles to be used for the transportation of pupils of a type other than passengers cars, station wagons, or buses with steel frames. Use of panel delivery trucks and buses with frame bodies may not be approved."

In other words, before approval will be given to the schools and transportation comes to them, the Department of Education is very specific in what may be approved. There may be some cost, as has been mentioned before, in the marking of these buses, but I say to the hon. members of the House, Mr. Speaker, what would be the cost of painting any kind of vehicle in comparison with one life which might be lost because traffic took that child's life as he was getting on or getting off a school bus?

The Ontario Safety League has also said that there is a tendency on the part of the children, with such a law in effect, to depend on traffic stopping, and, therefore, they use less caution in crossing in front of or behind buses. I say to the Ontario Safety League that that is all bunk because, after all, children are warned before they start out from home they are going to take care, just the same, even though they know

that traffic is supposed to stop. When we stop to think that there is only a short period in the morning and a short period period in the afternoon when traffic will be impeded in any way by these regulations, I cannot where there is much argument against this.

I do feel that, as it has been endorsed by so many and the need is getting greater every day, and as new areas in the province of Ontario are facing a problem with respect to this sort of transportation, we wouldtakea long step in the direction of providing safety for our children if we could pass this Act today. I hope it will receive the favourable consideration of the House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear. hear.

MISS. A. MACPHAIL (York East): I support the Bill. I am not going to put up an argument on it. It has been well done by people before me.

Section 2 says when a school bus is being operated upon a highway for purposes other than transportation of pupils either to or from schools the words "school bus" should be removed or covered. I think that is important. The highways in the province of Ontario have many signs about "men at work". Those men may have been "at work" six months before and the signs are still up. They will put up a sign indicating "bump".

For a while you look for the "bump" and then you disregard all the signs. I think that is very true in this matter. It is very important that school buses, -- it is very important that the lives of children be saved.

It is very important that when school buses stop, all traffic stops. It is equally important that when they are not used for school buses, they should cover the words: "School bus". I do wish the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) could do something about the signs "men at work".

They worry me when signs are erected indicating "men at work" when there are no men at work.

MR. J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): With the consolidation and such things going on, we are going to need more school buses in the near future and we should do more in the matter of creating standardized buses and regulations which will protect the children. The Ontario Safety League has always said "Expect the Unexpected, the children".

They issue a check of the number of accidents in which school children were involved for the three months of last winter. There were 318 school children involved in accidents -- 80 of those came from behind parked vehicles, 48 children were involved crossing rural highways. In the State of New York they have been handling this problem for quite a while. At a recent Session of the Senate they passed a Bill which will crack down on the offender passing buses from either direction. They even went further than that; they introduced a Bill, of which I have a copy here, which will make those who operate school buses hold safety drills three or four times a year to teach the children how to get out, use the exits or emergency exits. They have fire prevention apparatus in the buses. They teach the children safety regulations.

It is quite obvious these people have had a great deal more experience than we have had. We should do our best to take advantage of that experience. Peronally, I have seen quite a few different types of vehicles taking children to school and some of the vehicles are somewhat dilapidated and hard to recognize as school vehicles. I think we should do something to standardize the type of vehicle used so that we get the best type, and assist those small municipalities which may have difficulty in financing the purchase of such buses.

In the 43 States which made reports the inventory of traffic safety activities indicates there were over 2000 accidents in which school buses were involved. That is quite a number. It is evident that there must be and should be standard regulations throughout --

Hon. G.H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): From what is the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Easton) reading? Where does the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Easton) get the 2000 accidents?

MR. EASTON: This is in the 43 States of the Union.

MR. DOUCETT: What States?

MR. EASTON: The States of the Union. This is information I sent for to the Legislature of New York State in Albany, to get some information covering safety practices with respect to school buses. They provided me with this information. If it is of any use to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) I will be glad to send it over.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the explanations given with respect to this Bill. It has some merit, no doubt. We have given it a great deal of consideration in our Department. We have had our travelling engineer check different things. However, one of the very important features is that in the Province of Ontario, this is a comparatively new venture on School Buses. We have, I think, almost over 1,400 in all, buses of all types, which transport children to School. There are in that list many diffent kinds of cars and buses. This Bill, as introduced, is along the line of one of the United States, or, as a matter of fact, of many in the United States. By the Bill generally enacted in the United States, the vehicle must be painted a definite colour -- yellow, robin blue, or some other colour, but mostly yellow, as I remember in checking they have certain definite types of plaques .

I would like to tell you about the different kinds of vehicles which are used in the Province of Ontario. We have 467 ordinary passenger cars as School buses taking children to School, and we have 262 converted trucks, 80 station wagons and 576 standard busses. In addition to that, there are a number of those buses which draw passengers in the outskirts, or, probably, in the City of Toronto and in the morning and in the evening they have a contract under they which they take and bring children. I

do not think it would be just possible at the present time. We must be concerned about the cost to the School Sections across Ontario where they have over 467 private passenger cars, To ask them to paint them a certain colour or to bring them under some definite regulations, is certainly something which must come, but I think we should move reasonably slowly. Some say that in regard to the black, green, red and every other colour of car, and station wagon and bus, which I can show you many pictures which I have here -- as I said, our travelling engineers took pictures -- it would be very interesting for the hon. members to see them and I would be glad to show them to the hon. members. If we are to pass an Act now that every vehicle must stop at a School bus without having something more definite than at the present time I think we would only instill in the Province of Ontario a feeling of false security, that the Chairman would think, "Well, we are safe just as soon as we step out of this bus, we can dash across the road." Probably at that moment a motorist might come along who did not know about this or could not see anything different than an ordinary passenger car and strike some of those children down. I must say to the honl member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) who introduced this Bill, that at the present time or at least up until this year in the Public Vehicles Act, we had certain items on this, and in

our regulations there is the regulation that every vehicle carrying children must have displayed "School Bus." We have now made an amendment to that legislation in the regulations where every vehicle carrying children must display on the front and the rear a sign "School Bus" composed of letters at least eight inches in hight. However, they may have that displayed, there are many things which, might not be noticed.

I am very concerned about this, as the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Baxter) said, I think I have done as much as any man for the safety of the travelling public in the Province of Ontario. I am very interested in it, in continuing, promoting and improving it in every possible way, but I must say that I am somewhat doubtful passing this Act; infact, I am fairly positive that until we improve this, which will come in the passing of time, we would create in the minds of our children, a feeling of false security and would increase the loss. The loss of children on our highways due to School buses is one of the smallest, that is to say, the best records of which I know in America. I hope it will remain as such.

I would just say to the hon. members of this House that we are very mindful of the improvements in this way, an that as we progress and improve our bus situation, it would be, I think, ridiculous to ask that 460 or more paint

their buses for the small some of meoney they would be getting; but the time will come as all Schools grow and develop into School Sections, as they are doing now, when we will be able to have School buses and to go along with those other places which have been mentioned and at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the traffic laws of the Province of Ontario are in keeping with the demands of our people.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I might just say in conclusion, I think the Bill of the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing) has this merit; it keeps this problem in front of us. The great difficulty, as the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) has said, that in determining whether we are ready at the moment for such a move. The hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Baxter) gave the member of private cars involved. Remember, if this were a matter of some limits, if it were a question of School buses, such as we have in some of these large municipalities, here, I think the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) would say it would be pretty plain sailing; but, remember, you are legislating across a big Province. You have 400 or 500 private cars to be used for this. If you made a School bus of a private car, you can see the difficulties and complications involved. That private car may be only used for bus purposes for a short period each day. As the hon. Minister of Highways

(Mr. Doucett) has pointed out you have cases where buses which are used in other capacities may be used for transporting people to and from various parts of the urban areas which are perhaps used for School buses after different periods of the day. I quite agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett), and with the hon. member for Wellington North (Mr. McEwing), who introduced this Bill, and with those who have spoken. We are looking for the best ways of improving the situation which are compatible with our progress. I think, that, in view of the figures given by the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) we can indulge in the feeling that, while we are making progress, at the moment we do not seem to have reached that stage at which this is really a practical solution.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) has some pictures of various types of School buses. The hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) had an investigation made, I notice, covering all of the Province. I notice that some of the School buses are being used in my own area. I do not think this statutory amendment would be practical at the present time.

MR. C. K. FOSTER (Bruce): Does the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) think the day will come, even soon, when these feeder cars, or buses, will become of standard type? In the rural districts, where the students have so many miles to travel they must have feeder cars in the morning and at night to

take these people home, for one bus cannot make it during school hours. I think it will take years before you will get away from the problem of feeder cars to feed the standard buses.

MR. DOUCETT: I think the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Foster) is quite right, but, with such a very magnificent Government about which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has told you so much, there is no doubt our population will increase and we will progress.

MR. MacLEOD: I cannot agree with the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett)

MR. R. A. McEWING: (Wellington North): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the different remarks by the hon. members, by the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) and by the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). It seems to me the objections they have are not very serious.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

When you face it this way, the Bill does not direct that every vehicle and bus be painted a distinct colour. We are not asking for that. He is pointing out it would be impossible to do that. Well, if we wait for a stage which would make apparent any distinction as to a sign on a vehicle, until that can become a fact, a lot of lives are going to be lost. But we are asking that a distinct sign be placed fore and rear.

The other point that he spoke of, that they would have a false sense of security, that will be with them no matter when you get that, you will never remove that, as far as that goes, and if you wait until that will be a factor no longer to be considered, you will never have it, because we have got to make the thing as safe as we possibly can. I am hoping the government may see fit that we may have a distinctive license plate that would indicate what the vehicle is. It is not going to cost a great deal, we are not asking for the school bus owners to go to any great expense, nor are we asking the school boards to go to any great expense at all. I cannot see anything very objectionable to this, and I think it is worth trying.

We have not made anything of a political nature out of this, it is a matter of public benefit, and I would ask the Government to accept this Bill, or at least allow the House to vote on it as each hon. member sees fit, because it is not on a political

issue in any way, shape or form, and I do not see anything objectionable. I do not think the argument of the Hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) carries very much weight in this, and I would ask that we have a vote as a non-political issue, and that hon. members vote on it.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be a vote, may I move the adjournment of this debate and take the next Highways bill. I think we might clear them all off before six o'clock. There may be some other votes and we can take them all at the same time, if that is agreeable. It will save time.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Order No.10.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order, second reading, Bill No.61, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act. Mr. Brown.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No.61, "An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act".

I do not intend to take very much of the time of the House in referring to this Bill No.61, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, whereby the speed limit -- or, at least Section 28 of the Highway Traffic Act will be amended by adding thereto a section which reads as follows:

"That subject to Clause (a) fifteen miles per hour between the hours of eight a.m. and five p.m. within a school zone in a city, town, village, police village, or a built-up area."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is something which has been in the public mind I think for quite a number of years. It is something which has been approved by the Ontario Safety League and a recommendation from the Ontario Safety League has gone forward to all of the school boards throughout the province of Ontario in an endeavour to get them to try to convince the provincial government or the Department of Highways that such action is necessary. It is quite true that many municipalities at the present time have put up safety zones and --

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, pardon me -- I do not want to interrupt the hon. member (Mr. Brown) -- but did I understand him to say the Motor League had sent out requests for this?

MR. BROWN: No, the Ontario Safety League.

MR. DOUCETT: Oh, the Ontario Safety League.

MR. BROWN: That is right. I did not mention the Motor League. Many municipalities who have safety zones and so on, but these of course as you understand, have no legal effect, because Section 28, as I said before, of the Highway Traffic Act, clearly defines what the speed limit shall be within certain areas.

I hold in my hand here a copy of a report presented by the Ontario Safety League which is dated January, 1948, addressed to the secretaries of school boards through-

out the province of Ontario. I would like to quote a couple of extracts from this report dealing with provinces in which regulations are now in effect which provide for speed limits within school areas. In the province of British Columbia, for instance, the Motor Vehicle Act, Sedtion 57:

> "Every person driving or operating between the hours of eight o'clock in the forenonn and the hour of five o'clock in the afternoon of any day on which school is regularly held, a motor vehicle on any highway where signs are supplied sufficiently to warn a driver that he is approaching the vicinity of a school, shall slow down to 15 miles per hour while approaching or passing or in the vicinity of the school to which the sign relates -- "

and so on. Then with respect to the province of Quebec, according to paragraph 4 of The Highway Traffic Act, it says:

> "The Province of Quebec Motor Vehicles Act. Municipalities may not regulate the speed of motor vehicles on public highways."

We have no right to regulate the speed of motor vehicles in municipalities. On the other hand Article 41 of the same Act states that:

> " The speed of vehicles -- "

This is the provincial Act , --

> "The speed of vehicles shall not exceed 20 miles per hour when passing a school".

Now, this report is filled full of many places where they do have this in force at the present time. There is not or cannot be the objection to this recommendation which

the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) had to the previous Bill which passed through here. There should be no difficulty whatsoever in implementing this, and as has been pointed out before in argument with respect to the previous Bill, even if it is the means of saving one life, it will have served a good purpose.

As I say, it is something that is sponsored by the Ontario Safety League, which has the support of the school boards throughout the province of Ontario and one which I feel that the Department of Highways could very well accept as a Bill which would pass this Legislature and this Session.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the mover of this motion, it seems to me that if this applies to both city and rural areas, we are going to get into a little difficulty in cases where we now have safety patrols, where we now have schools opposite a tunnel where the traffic is travelling really below the ground line and where, with that safety patrol, the children get better protection than they really would get under this Bill. I wonder if he has anything to say in regard to that.

It would be foolish, for instance, to make any limit in the case, say, of the Jarvis Street extension, which is a speedway, and the traffic travels away below the streetline, and the place where the children walk. It nevertheless abuts on the highway and would come under this Bill.

It would also seem to be quite unnecessary in the case where there is a patrol. Those patrols do an awful lot better job than any slowing traffic will ever do.

MR. DOUCETT: Mr. Speaker, as with the other Bill, I appreciate the attention given by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown). This has some merits, and it is one of the Bills or one of the changes which I mentioned last year in the House that we are giving a lot of study to. There is a lot of things which dovetail into this, and it is one of the traffic problems which is very difficult. However, in the city areas, as the hon. member (Mr. Brown) has said, when he mentioned with regard to school areas, that presents another problem of daylight and standard times, of tourists, and after all, I think it goes back to the time a number of years ago when it was a privilege of each and every municipality in the province of Ontario to pass a by-law regulating the speed within their own boundaries, which created a great deal of difficulty and trouble and from the municipalities came many requests, in fact, not dozens, but hundreds, to have some unification across Ontario. After some time of study it was decided on the present Act.

Of course, in that Act, while the speed limit may be 30 miles an hour, that does not mean that that is the minimum speed, that is the maximum and of course every motorist must have his car at all times under control, driven with due care and attention and consideration for other persons using the highway. I do not think there is any body of people, as good as this Legislature may be, who can pass legislation to make matters of this kind perfect.

However, this is a matter which we would like to go on and give a little more study to. It may be possible that after we give it a little more time, we will

make recommendations to the House for your approval of some changes, but at the present time our 30 zone is 600 feet of built-up area on one side or 300 feet on both sides, and of course that prevails within the corporation, that I think that this would create considerable difficulty, that school days and school hours and all those things enter into it, especially I said having regard to standard and daylight saving times. And then what about the corporation? Well, it would have to be defined by zones, but then these zones within a city or town or urban centre would have to be different to that in the rural.

We have given a lot of consideration, Mr. Speaker, and are still studying this question, and I hope we will be able to come up with some solution that may be of benefit to the people of the province of Ontario.

The cities and urban centres deserve a great deal of credit, as the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) said, in the controlling of those sections. That, we find, is the greatest safety factor where there is very, very heavy traffic.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) for his very keen interest in safety in the province of Ontario. It was just a few months ago that we had him in Kitchener to speak to an organization there relative to this subject.

I also can foresee such problems as have been mentioned by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison). I was just wondering whether the definition of what constituted a "school zone," as contained in the proposed

amendment to section 1, would not overcome this difficulty.

I do appreciate the great work that is being done by the safety patrols. We have them in Kitchener and they are doing a very excellent piece of work, but their job is mainly to see the children are being escorted across the streets at the traffic signals and so on. They do not have the authority, of course, to take the numbers of cars which are going at a speed in excess of 30 miles an hour. The speed is still 30 miles an hour and as long as they have the car under their control -- and I think most of them can prove their cars were under control -- I do not think that is sufficient.

I would like very muchk therefore, to see this Bill go along with the previous Bill and have a vote of the House.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, then I move the adjournment of this debate for a few moments, and we will clear this up.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Order No. 14. Perhaps my hon. friend the member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) now might move the discharge of his Bill, so we might get it off the Order Paper.

MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourteenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act". Mr. Harvey (Sault Ste. Marie).

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I move the discharge of Bill No. 94.

Motion agreed to.

Bill 94 Discharged

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, a Bill in which I have been quite interested is a Bill standing in the name of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), Bill No. 128. We will call that order, and the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) might speak to the Bill. I have asked the law courts to study the principles of that Bill so that the matter may be given consideration at a later date. I think it raises quite an interesting principle, to avoid multiplicity of actions, but I may say we do not want to accept the principle without further investigation. However, I will call Order No. 16.

DIVISION COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixteenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 128, "An Act to amend the Division Courts Act". Mr. Grummett.

MR. W. U. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 128, "An Act to amend the Division Courts Act".

In presenting this Bill to the House, I did so after consulting quite a number of solicitors and practicing lawyers in my own district, and also interviewing the district court judge. I had quite a long interview with the judge and he fully approved of the suggestions I made at that time.

The idea behind the amendment is this: sections 156 and three or four other sections following in The Division Courts Act are known as the Consolidation sections. They provide for the consolidation of two or more judgments so that if a man has two judgments against him, it prevents

a multiplicity of executions or garnishees or actions of this kind being persued. The debtor can apply to the district court judge to have these actions consolidated and an order is then made and the man is ordered to pay so much per week or so much per month in court, which is apportioned to the judgements pro rata, as regards the amount of the judgment.

That step, Mr. Speaker, was a very forward step, and I commend the government for having brought it in and introduced it into the Division Court Act when we amended that Act last year. However, as a practicing solicitor, I found that it did not go quite far enough. A man who has two or three judgements against him invariably has several other claims that are waiting to appear in court.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

If he applies to have the judgments consolidated, other people with claims against him will say: "He is going to pay these judgments, and we will get nothing on our claims", so they will rush into Court, and it will mean the man has a lot of Court costs to pay. For instance, I had a case, Mr. Speaker, last Summer, where a man had around 40 or 45 claims against him. He asked me to make arrangements whereby he could pay them pro rata, to get out of his difficulties. I wrote to all the creditors. Some of them had judgments, and shortly I had written to them, I found that the result of my appealing to them was that they immediately put their claims to Court, and at that time the provisions of the Division Court Act had not been promulgated, so we could not apply for a consolidation order, and it resulted in a number of seizures being taken, and eventually it cleaned the man out of his assets, and he had to go out and go to work in the mill, and garnishees followed him into the mill. A company does not like to have men working for them when week after week garnishees are being placed against his wages.

If we could have had the amendment I suggested, the man could have appeared before a Judge on a Consolidation Order, and showed the Judge the number of judgments against him, and the number of creditors to whom he owed money, and asked for a consolidation of judgments and the Judge could fix the amount he had to pay, and it would have prevented the other creditors from placing their claims in Court, and thus piling up a tremendous amount of costs.

Even a man with $20. or $25. against him in Court

means $5. or $6 costs at least, without taking into account the distance the Bailiff may have to travel for service. A larger amount would increase the cost, of course, very much more, and by the time they are added to the amounts he owes, he has to pay perhaps 25% Court costs.

It is the opinion of a solicitor to whom I referred this matter, and the District Judge, that this is a very important amendment, and I would ask that it be given consideration by this government. I think it is a worthy step forward. The government went a considerable distance inbringing in section 156 and the following four or five sections, and I think the amendments we have provided would be very beneficial to a man who finds himself in an unfortunate financial position.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of merit in the hon. member's (Mr. Grummett) proposal. The Bill, however, is somewhat unusual. It introduces, in a way, a new practice in our Division Courts. The matter is being studied, and I have asked the Law Clerks for a report on the matter, and we will be very glad to give it consideration.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there is further consideration required on this Bill, and that I have a strong feeling of approval for the principles of the Bill, to avoid multiplicity of costs against a person who can ill afford them, and in addition to that depriving the creditors of whatever assets there are, I would like to move, in view of the investigation to be made, that the

Bill be not now read a second time, but be read thirty days hence.

Bill 128 stands.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call third readings. I understand the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) has an amendment to present on third reading of Bill No. 121. Perhaps he may have changed his mind.

I will call Order No. 1.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to promote Fair Employment Practices in Ontario", Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 121.

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Brown:

> "That the Bill be not now read a third time but referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to strike out the word 'his' where it occurs in the fourth line of section 3 and insert therefore the word 'sex', so that section 3 shall now read:
>
> 3. No employer or person acting on behalf of an employer shall refuse to employ or to continue to employ any person or

discriminate against any person in regard to employment or any term in condition of employment because of the sex, race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin of such person."

MR. FROST: I do not know whether the hon. member (Mr. Calder) wants to say anything, but the principle of this Bill was thoroughly in Committee of the Whole, and I do not think that the matter should be debated again today. However, if the hon. member (Mr. Calder) wants to say something, all right.

I would just point out that the Bill was never designed to bring in the matter of the discrimination in sex. That is not part of the principle of this particular Bill. As I said in Committee, this Bill relates to strangers within our gates, and it was never a matter of determining discrimination as between the sexes.

I might point out one or two cases. For instance, we have a number of young men in the army, now in Korea, and as we are short of labor in this country, their jobs may be taken by women, and in some cases married women. Is it the intention, when they come back, and ask for their jobs, to be faced with a Bill of this sort which imports women into their positions or jobs, and it was never intended to have the employers of this province say that they could not discriminate between an unmarried woman and a soldier returning from Korea. We have a pretty

high level of employment, but supposing there was a time when we did not, and the employers were asked to take on married men with families; are you going to create a situation whereby if an unmarried woman came and asked for the job, and the head of a family, with perhaps half a dozen children asks for the same job, if the employer does not give the job to the unmarried woman, he is guilty of discrimination? This Bill raises a situation which was never contemplated and the people who are advocating such a thing, are guilty of pretty "fuzzy" thinking.

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

J-1

MR. FROST: I do not think they have thought out the implications involved in any such move as this one. I can only hope that the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) would recognize that, that was discussed in Committee, and would not press this amendment which has no relationship to the problem with which he is attempting to deal.

MR. CALDER: Despite the urgent rumblings about me, I have no intention of entering into the debate. As the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has said, it was covered in Committee. The examples he has given here in the House and privately behind the Throne have not shaken the position I took on second reading. I am quite willing to learn from experience, but that experience will be practiced under the law. If the law, as I would like to see it amended, works out in any degree as disastrously as the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) indicates, I am quite prepared to reverse my position.

MR. FROST: I do not wish to agree to a law which will create disaster and chaos amongst our people and which will create circumstances which run quite contrary to the public policy of this country. Our position has been that, as regards women, women's labours should not be used as slave labour in this province, that if they have jobs and are doing work, they should be paid on equal terms with men. That, I think, is the principle we have to forward in this House. To take this on, which deals with discrimina-

tion in race, colour and creed, and extend it to the complicated relationships of men and women in this province, is positively unthinkable. When the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) introduced his bill in the House, he had the good sense not to include it; to put this in, I do not think is good legislation. I do not think it is good sense.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the hon. members.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, while the House is awaiting for the hon. members to assemble, perhaps I might save time by covering the order of business.

I would like, after the dinner recess, to proceed with the Budget Debate, and to clean up the Budget Debate to the point that the Hon. Leaders of the Opposition and the Government would be the speakers to-morrow. Then it would be the principal order of business to wind up the Budget Debate, have the vote, and the carrying through of the ordinary routine bills. There are one or two bills still on the Order Paper of private members' which I would like to call, if possible, to-night. One is the Act relating to Highway Improvements, which is in the name of the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck). We might discuss that to-night and postpone the vote until to-morrow, if a vote is required, and have the vote with the other votes to-morrow. It will be called at that time. That is about the situation, and it will save time if I might be able to inform the House

of this procedure now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, may I respectfully request that you put the motion?

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment calls for referring the bill back to the Committee when it is voted that it be not referred back to the Committee, it automatically means, of course, the Bill is carried.

Rule 56 reads as follows:

> "If on an amendment to the question that a Bill be now read a second time or the third time, it is decided that the word 'now' or any words proposed to be left out stand part of the question, Mr. Speaker shall forthwith declare the bill to be read a second, or the third time, as the case may be."

That was accepted last year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, that rule does not apply to this particular case. Rule No.56, as I read it, does not apply to these circumstances at all. The question has come up before, and, may I respectfully point out to you, Mr. Speaker, apart from any technical considerations which I frequently argued before in this House, that unless the main motion is put after an amendment is either carried or defeated, it is quite possible for hon. members of the House to be deprived of an opportunity of making their position clear.

main motion; there are those who might want to vote for the amendment and against the main motion; there are those who might want to vote against the amendment and for the main motion. I submit the result of the main motion could have been pre-determined by the fate of the amendment. So many different alternative positions, all of which become obscure if the vote is on the amendment and on the amendment alone.

MR. PORTER: There is nothing obscure about it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They are two entirely distinct questions. I submit that any rule or any attempt on the part of the government to prevent hon. members from making their position clear on any or every motion, or amendment which comes before the House, is not a proper practice.

Ayes 33.

Nays 43.

Motion negatived on division.

MR. SPEAKER: I can only be governed by the Rules of the House. Last year it was necessary to spend considerable time referring to May, which is our accepted authority beyond Lewis, and the procedure is very definite that on an amendment that a bill be not now read a third time, that is definitely part of the amendment. "The Bill be not now read a third time." is definitely there.

MR. MacLEOD: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that something follows after that.

MR. SPEAKER: This is the crux of the amendment. It is moved by Mr. Calder, seconded by Mr. Brown, that the bill be not now read a third time.

MR. MacLEOD: May I ask, Mr. Speaker, whether any precedents are cited in the rules governing it?

MR.SPEAKER: One.

MR. FROST: The matter has been decided and debated in the House several times.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker has made a ruling.

MR. MacLEOD: I am not now questioning Mr. Speaker's ruling. My request was for information.

MR. PORTER: You can read it up to-night.

MR. SPEAKER: I would be very happy to give further references on my ruling, but it must stand as at present. I shall be very glad to look into my little black book and bring up-to-date the various references I have used on various occasions immediately the House resumes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, you are reserving your ruling?

MR. SPEAKER: No; I am reserving my references.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Last year the same point arose in connection with The Labour Relations Act. I know that we were able to get a division on the main motion. I would further point out that I think the Government should agree with us on this.

MR. FROST: All of this is out of order.

This matter has been decided on other bills. I do not think, Mr. Speaker's ruling is debatable. The fact is that the Opposition voted against the Bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We have voted against some things to-day which were out of order, and probably to-morrow we will, too. No hon. Minister wishes to be an obstructionist about it, or to prevent business being transacted when it should be transacted, nor does any hon. member of this House wish to deprive any other hon. member of an opportunity to make his position clear. I would have thought the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would agree with me on this. I know Mr. Speaker must enforce his rulings, as he sees them -- and I am sure he will -- but I would have thought, if there is any question of the ruling standing in the road, this should be done. I refer to Bill No.82, Page 150, of last year's Journal. I do not think I need to go into details, but the same point did arise there, and there were two divisions.

MR. SPEAKER: I have only a faint recollection of that particular case. I believe that it is with the full consent of the House that the test should be made. Naturally, the House is its own master and the hon. members can over-rule any ruling of Mr. Speaker by unanimous consent, call for a vote, and, Mr. Speaker's ruling can either be sustained or defeated.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, in full deference

to your ruling, and without prejudice, I respectfully ask the consent of the House to the main motion bei ng put, as well as the amendment. I ask for the consent of all hon. members of the House, so that justice may be done.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, surely in view of the fact that the Government has on so many occasions asked the House to overlook the Rules in order to expedite and facilitate the transaction of business, the Government is not going to refuse such a reasonable request.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we are all quite agreed that on minor matters, the full consent of the House should be given. I am quite prepared to allow the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to ask for the consent of the House.

MR. FROST: I think it might be well to get this matter clarified. If Mr. Speaker would give his reasons for judgment, it could come up to-morrow. If it is a question of revising rulings, or looking at this matter again to-morrow, we can do it at that time. Of course, the fact of the matter is, the motion is made for third reading, then the amendment is moved that the bill "be not now read a third time". It seems to me that it automatically passes in the words of the motion; "The House says yes, the Bill is to be read a third time and the motion is defeated." Let Mr. Speaker make his ruling to-morrow and we will carry this point over, and it can be determined to-morrow

afternoon. We will have Mr. Speaker's ruling and we will consider it at that time. In the meantime we can go ahead with the balance of the third readings and the votes on the two bills. We can give consideration to this to-morrow when Mr. Speaker gives his reasons. We will then have the whole case before us.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I want to be sure I understand the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) correctly. If Mr. Speaker's decision is in our favour, there is no problem; if it is not in our favour, then do I understand the Hon.Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is not consenting to my request?

MR. FROST: I will take into consideration whether I will have mercy on you for voting against that bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is pretty "fuzzy" thinking. I did not vote against the bill.

MR. DUNBAR: It won't look good.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall bring my ruling in to-morrow. I can assure the hon. members that it will be impartial, there will be no discussion by either Government or Opposition hon. leaders or hon. members in respect to my ruling. I want to be perfectly frank and honest about that. I believe we have now called the bill as passed, and I am ready to declare it as passed.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I hope the Government is not going to ask us to consent to any more toleration.

MR. FROST: I would like, Mr. Speaker, to reserve

judgment on the whole question the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has raised, and, if Mr. Speaker's decision is to the contrary, then we will, as I say, decide whether we will be merciful, or not, in this question; but, we can decide that to-morrow.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We may have to defer our decisions, too.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.3.

REGULATION OF LEASEHOLDS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third order, third reading of Bill No.133, An Act to Provide for the Regulation of Leaseholds. Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.133.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.4.

THE NIAGARA PARKS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th Order; Third reading, Bill No.141, An Act to Amend the Niagara Parks Act, Mr. Daley.

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.141.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.5.

RURAL TELEPHONES SYSTEMS

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th Order; third reading, Bill No.146, An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems. Mr. Challies.

HON. G. H. CHALLIES: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.146.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.6.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th Order; third reading, Bill No.152, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, Mr. Doucett.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT(Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.152.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Has the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) decided to strike out the "Beds of Navigable Waters"? Is that being withdrawn?

HON. H. S. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and

Forests): No.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I might also say, on a point of order, that this is all highly irregular, on Wednesday for third readings to take precedence over all other business.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.8.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order, second reading, Bill No. 39, An Act to Amend the Highway Traffic Act, Mr. McEwing.

MR. SPEAKER: The vote is on the amendment to Bill No.39.

Call in the members.

(Take K follows)

K-1

MR. SPEAKER: Is it satisfactory to take the same vote?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The amendment negatived on division.

AYES: 33

NAYS: 42

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 10.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Tenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 61, " An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act", Mr. Brown.

Second reading negatived.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, how does the matter stand? As far as we are concerned, we are prepared to accept the same vote. Whether the hon. members to my right are or not, I do not know. I am prepared to ask for a vote on it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The same vote?

MR. MACLEOD: The same vote.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Speaker, should we not have a decision from the hon. Leader of the Government (Mr. Frost) on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader in the north-east corner (Mr. MacLeod) apparently settled the matter when he obtained the consent of the hon. member of his party.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): I understand that the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) suggested that all votes should be left until nearer the end of the sitting.

MR. FROST: All right, if the hon. members wants a vote.

Order No. 16.

THE DIVISION COURTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixteenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 128, "An Act to amend the Division Courts Act", Mr. Grummett .

MR. JOLLIFFE: It was my impression the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) moved a hoist.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would like to have a vote on this. The same vote reversed -- the other way around.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now six o'clock, I do leave the Chair.

And at six of the clock p.m.,the House took recess.

- - - - - - - - -

The House resumed at eight of the clock p.m.

MR. J. F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Debate on the Budget, I would like to join with those who have already spoken in extending sincere congratulations to you as Speaker in this Third Session of the Twenty-Third Legislature. You add much dignity to the use of the gavel, most certainly with great honour to yourself. The kind acts and graciousness of your wife and self are greatly appreciated and do much to make to make one feel more at home -- incidentally, nine weeks away from home as of tomorrow.

I would like at this time to express my appreciation of the contribution made by many hon. members of this House both on the Throne Speech and on the Budget Address. I hesitate to prolong the sitting of this Session, but I do feel that after all I have listened to, I have a right and a duty to speak for a short time on behalf of the great people of the banner county of Perth, whom I have the honour to represent.

AN. hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. EDWARDS: I have here a very interesting clipping from the morning paper:

> "One hundred years ago Perth county warden was appointed to position"

For over 100 years, Perth county has played a very important part in the development of this great province of ours. It is my honour to represent in this House Perth county plus the town of Palmerston, where I was born and where I reside. Until 1934, Palmerston was in North Wellington provincially, and still is in North Wellington federally.

April 4, 1951.

AA-2

I believe I am the first Palmerston-born to become a provincial member.

From the riding I represent have come many people who have played a very prominent part in this province both in this Legislature and out. Among them I might mention the honourable Lyon H. Clarke, Lieutenant-Governor, the honourable Nelson Monteith, the first minister of Agriculture, and the hon. J. W. Monteith. And I would not want to forget the Liberal group; the one-time leader of the Liberal group, the honourable Wellington Hay, who resided in the town of Listowel. Others who took a prominent place in the government and its departments include Dr. Berry, who is in the Department of Health and who comes from St. Mary's. And in the legal profession, I think possibly one of the first lady K.C.'s was a schoolmate of mine and came from my town. I refer to Miss Margaret Hindman, K.C.

Perth county is recognized as one of the most prosperous counties, with diversified industry and the finest of farm lands.

Another intesting fact which reflects great credit upon the county officials and those who make up local governments is contained in an article which appeared in "Civic Administration" a short time ago:

> "No debenture debt for quarter century.
>
> On NOvember 10, Perth county, in south western Ontario, passed the quarter century mark of being free from debenture debts. It is believed by clerk-treasurer F. W. Armstrong that no other county in the area has been debt-free for as long a period as this.

April 4, 1951.

AA-3

It was on November 10, 1925, that the last debenture of $1,059.85 was paid off and no others have been incurred since that time."

You can see then that Perth county holds an enviable position in rank in relation to county; it has been abundantly blessed with progress over the period of years.

One problem which is growing is due to the inflation which has grown over a period and which confronts each and every one of us, whether on the farm, in business, or retired. I refer to the increasing costs and shortages which naturally affect our whole economy and often results in hardship to our older citizens, particularly. We are happy to have the assurance of the government that their co-operation is willingly offered to combat the situation.

2 We were very pleased to receive the announcement by the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) as head of the government, stating a clear-cut poisition in connection with extending the old age pensions system by agreeing with the federal government that pensions should be given to all our veteran citizens without a means test, and the persons between the ages of 65 and 69 inclusive , the provincial and federal governments would extend pensions to all needy persons. Our senior citizens are surely entitled to these benefits at the earliest possible date.

In passing, I would like to pay tribute to the hon. Minister in charge of this Department, the hon. William A. Goodfellow, Minister of Welfare. His Department is certainly to be commended for its sympathetic and reasonable administration. A "good fellow" in every sense

of the word, who holds the respect of every hon. member of the House.

Like others, I would however, point out that it would be gratifying to see an extension by way of assistance to those unemployables through physical handicaps and illness, other than by direct relief. The government of this province is certainly to be congratulated for its promotion, co-operation and mutual understanding prevailing at federal-provincial conferences to date. Much can be accomplished when meetings on that basis are held for the benefit of our senior citizens.

The government is to be congratulated for its increase in provincial subsidies to municipalities who, like individuals, have their problems too, -- rising costs on every hand, teachers' salaries, employees' wages, and all the services. I suppose every hon. member of the House has had many resolutions requesting the government to assume a larger share of the cost of education and social services.

One problem, flood control, although partially now being held by the Thames Power Authorities, affects St. Mary's and Mitchell districts. However, another still exists at the town of Listowel. I sincerely hope before long the municipalities will come together in agreement and form similar authorities to that of the Thames Valley. It is interesting to note that, 50 years ago in this House,

> "Among the Estimates brought down in the Ontario Legislature this month is an item for $4,000. for Elma township, in regard to deepening and improving

April 4, 1951.

AA-5

the Maitland River"

Thus we see that flooding and conservation was in the minds of those in the Legislature, and in different groups as far back as 50 years ago.

It is very gratifying to see how the municipalities have received these authorities and how they have gone into it with all their hearts and souls.

From a recent notice, I find that the Thames Valley authority authorized a call for tenders for a project at Mitchell, to cost the province $240,000. Mitchell was one of the first municipalities to vote money when the Thames Authority was organized and put into operation. This project at Mitchell necessitates a new bridge on the highway at Mitchell, which the Department of Highways will be required to build.

I would like to refer briefly to the government position and its support in the Budget for community centres. It is to be congratulated for this worthy effort on behalf of community centres in this province, backing the efforts of community- minded citizens and providing places and equipment for sport and training of youth in this great province of ours. It is my sincere wish that every municipality in my county, and others, would be interested in similar projects. I believe two townships in Perth are even considering a joint effort, and they are to be congratulated. It is to be my pleasure and privilege tomorrow night to officially open a $100,000. community hall and arena in the village of Milverton, serving Milverton and district.

(TAKE "BB" FOLLOWS)

The whole effort is a grand example of what co-operation will accomplish in any community. During the past year, the following grants have been paid on that account in Perth County:

Mitchell	Athletic Field	$4,500.	(1949-1950)
Stratford (Shakespeare Ward)	Athletic Field	1,400.	(1950)
Milverton	Arena and Hall	10,000.	No grant paid. Papers on file except expenditures.
Mitchell	Arena		Papers not complete. No grant paid.

During the past year, two new hospitals have been opened in Perth County, at Stratford and St.Marys, through the co-operation of Provincial and Federal Governments.

The Governments are to be congratulated on their bonus assisting hospitals for 1950. Grants and bonus were as follows:

Stratford	$ 36,240.34	plus	13,316.80	- $49,557.14
Listowel	6,681.87	"	304.64	6,986.51
Palmerston	1,458.17	"	613.12	2,071.29

I would like briefly to refer to the extensive growth of Hydro, and the support the rural Hydro has received. For rural use there are 1349.7 miles servicing 7421 farmers, as of December 31st, 1950, showing an increase of 2707 farmers being served over the past five years.

A great debt is owed to the foresight and wisdom of those who ably served on Commissions through the years.

It is only a few weeks ago conversion to 60 cycle was put in effect at St.Marys - and within the year or 1952 at the latest, the job should be completed over the whole County - another efficient change.

There is one submission I would like to present which I think would benefit the whole province in connection with rates or charges for power. I have served for some years on our local Commission and do feel we should be drawing closer to the time when a flat rate be instituted for the whole province. Our municipalities financed their own lines years ago, built reserve funds for replacements and it would seem fair to me and would certainly implement to the full the aim of its founder which actually was power at cost to all the citizens of this great province of ours. A flat rate would enable our smaller communities to have a better chance of securing an industry and competing with cities who unfortunately acquire too many.

Many stormy meetings and debates in and our of this House were a matter of course for quite sometime. Many bitter battles were waged by private power interests. Approval of ratepayers of all the co-operating municipalities was necessary. In this City, it is most interesting to note that the Clerk of the House, Major Alex C. Lewis, K.C. - a reporter then in the employ of The Evening Telegram, was engaged by the City Council in the year 1908 to direct Hydro's publicity campaign in

Toronto. As we would expect, he did then, as ever since, a good job. The slogan in favor of the Hydro partnership was "An Investment, Not a Debt", a very suitable slogan. And how true it has proven over the intervening years. I must add that all that Alex Lewis received for his services for this Hydro publicity campaign was a fifty dollar bill - which he more than deserved.

Hydro development in the past is a very interesting story - which is available in a book published by Ryerson Press, entitled "Adam Beck and The Ontario Hydro", by W. R. Plewman. It resulted from a favorable attitude of the Whitney Government towards a cheap power movement which was gaining momentum through the work of a committee acting for the western Ontario municipalities. A meeting held in Berlin (now Kitchener) on Feb.17, 1903,-- representatives from Stratford and St.Marys were present -- marked the first gathering at which Adam Beck, Mayor of London and Member of this Legislature attended. A further meeting held in July saw a committee appointed to gather information and to take steps to form a union of municipalities interested in cheap power. It is interesting to note that George McLagan of Stratford (now deceased) was a member of that committee. The move received growing and increasing support through the years until to-day possibly Perth County is one of the greatest users as a County., Hydro developments in Perth County, hand in hand with the efforts of progressive farmers, are accountable for the degree of prosperity which exists in the County.

BB-4

Now just a word regarding our breeding stock and Calf Clubs. William C. Davidson of Listowel was a member of the first Calf Club in Perth County, organized under the present rules and regulations, as we have them in this province.

(TAKE "CC" FOLLOWS)

At that time all calf Club Calves for central and western Ontario were shown at the Canadian National Exhibition as far as inter-county competitions were concerned. W.C. Davidson was successful in winning first price with his Holstein heifer calf.

It was interesting to note that this year at the annual meeting of the Holstein Friesian Association of Canada, that W.C. Davidson was elected as a director.

I think possibly if one went up around Stratford two or three times a month, they would see buyers there from other states, who are taking a lot of our cattle at high prices, as their stock is good.

Fur farming is still the major project in Perth county. Within 15 miles of Stratford there are 40 breeders, I have been around through these Fur farms, and they are certainly doing a large share of the business in fur farming in that province.

In the Perth county, there are a number of Fall Fairs, and these are divided into two classes, "(b)" and "(c)", and I was hoping to hear our Deputy-Speaker (Mr. Patrick) speak more fully than he did about our Fall Fairs.

Then, there have been, as hon. members know, substantial increases in the grants to the Universities, which I am sure are quite necessary,in view of the rising cost.

I would say, in connection with text books, it would be a happy thought if at a future date the government could go even further. As a druggist in a small town, may I say that we sell textbooks which has created quite a situation in the last few years, on account of the number you have to toss out occasionally on account of changes in

the books, and I hope that some time a system may be arrived at where the books are all supplied by one central agency of the government, which would enable us to keep a supply, as there would be very few changes in them. It would certainly be very helpful, and I am sure it would be well received.

There is another problem that is being gradually ironed out, and that is in relation to secondary schools, and that has been carefully considered in Perth county.

The association with the School Boards in my area has been most pleasant. I might say it was my happy privilege sometime ago to have the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) of our province open a new High School in the town of Listowel, and there has been since then quite a substantial addition to the public schools in some town. This included two-room school building in the village of Sebringville, and I do not think it has a leaky roof.

MR. McEWING: Wait until it has been up a while.

MR. EDWARDS; The schools we have, have proven very satisfactory. The school area system is complete in Perth county now. The Department has been very fair, and has given us a great deal of assistance.

Now, may I say just a few words about highways.

Perth County being in Central Western Ontario, has highways 7,8,19, 23 and 86 within its boundaries. We are most grateful for the attention given our highways, and respectfully urge a furthering of re-surfacing and grading to complete the links on a heavy travelled artery, No. 86, serving from the North to Kitchener, and Highway 23, or Highway 7 serving a tourist trade from Western

Ontario to United States border points, and to Muskoka, and to the north.

Many Granges, Board of Trades, and Chambers of Commerce are supporting this project. In severe winter days, when possibly trucks cannot get through, we must ask ourselves this question: "Is all this trucking saving any costs or putting any more money into the farmers' pockets? The answer must be:"No". We all realize that this is a major problem, and becomes more critical, when it might be increased at the expense of the jobs of many railway men in the counties in this area, in Perth particularly, in Palmerston, and Stratford, and other division points. A letter appeared in several papers in our area, and the Beacon Herald on Monday put the problem very fairly.

There is one thing that we find rather disturbing in our area, and that is the lack of proper lighting on our highways, especially those who go through the more important centres, such as the town of Shakespeare, Even where they have the blinker lights, it does not seem to slow the people up to any great extent.

In some places one sees wrecks of cars, with a big "X" besides them, so the drivers coming along will, they hope, take . heed, and possibly go a little slower.

The Chamber of Commerce in Listowel is preparing a picture which points out very clearly the roads through the county toward the north.

Another feature to which I wish to drrw the attention of the House is the question of directing new industries to the centres in the county. We have had a great deal of help

from the Department of Planning and Publicity, and I am sure that those who live in Perth county, will say that it is a very nice place in which to live.

Perhaps before I go on I should return to the question of highways for a moment.

If you come to the city of Stratford and the city of Ste. Mary's, and branch out from there, you will notice that our highways are today are taking an awful beating from heavy trucking, which I think should be reviewed immediately, as it may continue to get heavier. During the war we realized the value of the common carriers, and for years special carrier rates were given to cattle, and farm produce, such as milk, butter and eggs. I wonder if that could not be continued. Truckloads of milk come right from Perth County to this city, every day. By that, now, to return to the question of attracting new industry to centres in the county. I am happy to relate that St. Mary's , a separated town, has taken advantage of the assistance offered by the Department of Planning and Publicity in regard to the upkeep of its roads, through the formation of a Suburban Road Commission. I would, however, submit to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) that further extended relief should be given. The free press quoted from an address given by Mr. Donald Gordon, the President of the Canadian National Railways, delivered to the Canadian Club in Montreal recently, in which he said:

> "The Canadian National management is ready not only to recognize the technical advantages inherent in motor vehicle carries, but to make use of them in

providing combined rail and highway services for the greater convenience of the public. Proposals in this direction had been frustrated by the refusal of competent authorities to licence railway-owned bus or truck services."

Then, in regard to competition between highway transportation and railways, Mr. Gordon views it as the major national transportation problem of this decade.

(TAKE "DD" FOLLOWS)

Having given considerable thought to the suggestion by C. N. R. officials that they discontinue passenger train service from Palmerston to both Kincardine and Southampton, I feel the people of these communities should not accept this development without due consideration and realizing once this type of service is discontinued it is finished. You will not be likely to regain it back no matter how desirable it might be in the future.

We can all well remember when the C.N.R. quietly discontinued all C.N.R. service between Wingham and Clinton, even removing the rails and bridges, making sure this service was at an end. I think it is an understood fact that everyone, including the C.N.R. Executive, realized a serious mistake had been made, but nothing can be done about it - the damage was already done.

I feel an investigation should be made and that the C.N.R. does not dispose of this right of way. It might be very necessary to relay these tracks and build the bridges in the not too distant future. Personally I think this service should be re-established. The removal of this rail connection meant a bus business was built up, and I would say a very profitable one, between Wingham and London which not only takes the business from Blyth and Wingham and communities further north, but also takes a large business all the way from Clinton to London that otherwise would patronize the C.N.R. Wingham and

community of course suffer the most.

I suggest here again we are faced with the problem of the C.N.R. suggestion to denude us still further of the services the railroad were built to give. Frankly I feel we must not accept these things as inevitable. I feel the people of Wingham Lucknow, Kincardine, Southampton, Port Elgin, Walkerton, Brussels, Harriston, and all surrounding communities should collectively take the necessary action to see to it that this passenger service is retained. The removal of passenger service in the Huron and Bruce area is a very serious thing to the communities in many ways and we as citizens owe it to ourselves, our families, and future generations to do all in our power to build, not tear down, essential services for our community.

Let us view this from another angle, I feel the C.N.R. have let their service go down to a point where they are not competitive with practically any means of transportation, whereas they should be leaders. They have spent as little as possible on the road bed and rolling equipment on these branch lines to the point where they now have to spend a few dollars which, evidently, they wish to avoid. Remember, this is the foot in the door. Out with the passenger service, and then if the business goes down, cut the freight. To me it is a defeatist attitude unbecoming to a public-owned corporation. I feel they are tearing down where they should be

building up; looking only in one direction to save dollars, not to make them. I would suggest a better attitude would be to analyze the communities and determine the potential possible volume of business to be had and go out and get it. Do things to build it up. Put on a small fast train from Kincardine and Southampton, joining at Palmerston and other lines to Toronto and return, and give the people proper service. Be competitive. Hundreds of people would use this transportation if service was as it should be.

This whole area is building up, more people are moving in every day. It is certainly not the time to be cutting out service. These towns want more industries to help pay the taxes which are becoming such a burden on home-owners. This can only be done by getting more people and more industries to help carry the load. Certainly cutting off passenger train service is not conducive to attracting new industries and people at a time when people in large cities are looking to the day when they can be out in the more rural areas and fresh air, and when executives of large industries are working to decentralize and get out to smaller towns where traffic and labor problems are much more favourable.

I am sure everyone will agree that to discontinue this passenger service would be a definite handicap to these communities. It would isolate our towns and villages regardless of what bus and truck

services there might be, particularly in winter time when train service is absolutely essential, and it is the duty of every one of us to see that we retain this service regardless of any reports of efficiency experts regarding the C.N.R. not making any money in this particular area. Let us labor under no false illusions that to cut out these trains would help your taxes because it would not save any one of use a dollar in years.

The railway was given a franchise to give us service and that is all we are asking. This community has paid many dollars towards the deficit of the C.N.R. and will likely have to continue to do so at least until the government decides to act and put the C.N.R. on a proper capitalization basis, based on a fair value of assets and not on the terrifically inflated capital now improperly charged against it. I think that the excess should be transferred to where it belongs - our national debt. Then with proper capitalization let us see what our C.N.R. executives can do. Det us put them in a position to be compared to other comparable companies. I am sure they would give a good account of themselves. I am privileged to know many of them and would say emphatically - give these men a chance on a fair overhead basis and we will see a different picture as far as C.N.R. deficits are concerned.

There is no finer or more loyal group of employees in any industry than is found on the rail-

roads, from the top down, and I feel that if they could see where by time, work, effort and co-operation, it would be possible to make the C.N.R. into a profitable corporation, it would be a little stimulant to do so, and in turn if they give the proper service they should be favoured with the proper share of the business from the community.

On the other hand, however, the mere fact that with the old financial burden the C.N.R. shows a deficit, it is no reason for the people of our community, and Huron and Bruce, to be penalized because some efficiency expert can show where a few dollars can be saved regardless of service. I am sure the divisional and local executive and employees of the C.N.R. personally have no desire to penalize this community by discontinuing this service. The suggestions must be from others who have not the same interest in our community. The C.N.R. officials who had the meetings in the community showed every evidence of wanting to be absolutely fair in considering the subject.

May I suggest I am sure our members of parliament would be only too pleased and happy to discuss and help promote any sound suggestions regarding this subject. We are fortunate in having men who will go after things of this kind aggressively, particularly if some group or council could see fit to start something going. I feel now is the time to have vision. Let us look ahead. We are living

in the finest country on earth, the country to which so many millions look with longing eyes across the seas, a country where in a few years we will have a greatly increased population.

To be worthy of our heritage, to do our part to help build Canada, and that means first, a greater Huron and Bruce, a key spot in our province, that means better service to the people, I would like to ask for the fullest support from all concerned to any group who see fit to take some action in this matter. At least be prepared that if any further evidence of cessation on the part of the C.N.R. is evident that we be ready to take the necessary steps to protect the interests of the community.

I might say, that railways are the life-line of the country and they cannot be replaced. We have all received different circulars from shipping and rail associations and I think definitely the time has come when there should be some rule made to make freer competition between the railways, trucks and buses. I would like briefly to refer to this railway situation just for this reason, it effects a lot of residents in my riding and those of us who know the railroad men know they are the very finest in our own town. The butcher's son, and the farmer's son, take their places and work on the railways and the men are certainly to be commended, they are a fine group of men and I think in all fairness to them and to the railroad as a

work on the railways and the men are certainly to be commended, they are a fine group of men and I think in all fairness to them and to the railroad as a

common carrier they should be given a reasonable amount of protection against unfair competition.

I was very interested in hearing some remarks on housing just yesterday and sometimes I think we hear a lot of arguments and I would just like to point out that some of the arguments just do not hold too much water. As a matter of fact, all one has to do is drive around the City of Toronto or in any of our Towns and Villages and see the blocks of new houses, there is a big growth at this time and I think that goes for other ridings as well as my own. It seems to me if fair profits were the rule for suppliers and all that goes to build a house, many more would be erected. The houses being erected are erected by people who do not want to ask the Government for subsidies but just go ahead and build their homes as our predecessors did and they must have been in a good Government.

In closing, I would say it is most fortunate that there is no probincial income tax to further embarrass the poor tax-payers. We are also happy to learn the Honl Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) assert that there would be no provincial sales tax. I am sure every hon. member of the House has received letters touching on this vital question. The budget, as I say, all goes to the credit of the Government and to the people which they serve.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Deputy

Speaker, in rising to take an apprentice's part in the budget debate, let me first of all search for a reason for that inexplicable applause. I will attribute it to the previous speaker. In passing, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to hop you would accept my neighbourly greetings to you in your Chair. Everyone has been careful, and deliberately so, to pay his respects to Mr.Speaker but Mr. Deputy Speaker serves a very useful and even a very laborious, in fact the most laborious part, of the service in the Chair and I would like to be on record as acknowledging the good relations which exist between my constituency and the constituency of Middlesex North.

That was a most interesting speech we heard from the hon. Menber for Perth (Mr. Edwards). There is a disposition of this Assembly in the last two or three years, I have been told, in seeming readiness to treat this as a deliberative body and to give a slightly larger place to the part that private members may make to the debates. While the speeches of the government hon. members are particularly welcome, at least by me, it was rather difficult to hear the last speaker because of the murmurations from his own benches, but I did pick up some interesting points --

MR. DUNBAR: You do not think we are hearing you, I cannot hear a word you are saying.

MR. CALDER: I will try to help you out.

MR. DUNBAR: Speak up.

MR. THORNBERRY: Bring your chair over here.

MR. DUNBAR: Get the cherry out of your cheek.

MR. OLIVER: That is rather crude, to say the least.

MR. CALDER: At least, Mr. Speaker, that is not the tongue which is employed on the Ministerial benches that is speaking. What I was going to say was this, this disposition to give to the hon. members of the House a little more latitude in this Legislature is one we all appreciate by curbing our own tongues so that the time of the House may be more widely distributed amongst all hon. members.

The readiness of the government this Session to give us half holidays on Wednesday afternoons which we very much enjoyed as a relief from the government business, for the consideration of private members' Bills is one such indication. The responsibility that goes with that is that we try to keep to the point, get on it and get off it so the House may pass on to more interesting things.

There is another observation I would like to make about the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and to his credit. That is, as has been observed by an hon. member on this side, the hon. Prime Minister is at his best when he lifts himself out of what was called "the primitive practices of politics". I am here

to testify, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the best of my necessarily limited knowledge, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has usually behaved himself in relations to the city of London. I am not playing with words, what I mean is this, that as far as I have been able to see and perhaps I have not been permitted to see everything that goes on in the Government, there has been no attempt to penalize the City of London, to slight it or to withhold from it any good thing that it deserves because that City in the last general election did not prefer Mr. Drew's candidate. If I am wrong in that and I may be wrong, I want to be corrected, but if anything has been held back from the City of London the fight cannot start too soon, I hope I am right.

MR. FROST: Do you know of anything that has been withheld from London?

MR. CALDER: I asked you.

MR. FROST: You live there.

MR. CALDER: No, and I hope I am right.

MR. DUNBAR: I told the Mayor you were a nice fellow and to be good to you.

MR. CALDER: I would ask the Mayor to do the same for you and with our new Mayor you had better watch out. Now, to return to the budget, I think I must preface my remarks by, not a punch line, but a line from Punch and Punch expresses these things so subtly that one must get the wording exactly right. In speaking of the cost of living in the Old Country, Punch puts it this way "All the January sales have

been well attended by women customers but never before have they had to pay such exorbitant prices for "bargains". If that has sunk in, I can say somtimes Ontario can equally say that they never had to pay such an exorbitant price for a government that claims to be a bargain.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(TAKE "EE" FOLLOWS)

MR. FROST: That is the cost of living that is happening under your government.

MR. CALDER: The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) suffers from an occupational hazard, he tends to develop a view of "making a property of the public." That is an attitude the public resents and particularly so when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) pats the fat parts and claims credit for all the gain in weight.

I think that as a statistician, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would admit that his financial operations do not to any comparable degree have the same effect on the economy even of this province as the Dominion Budget must have on the economy not only of the country but also of Ontario. In fact, I imagine that there is a pretty steady correlation between gross national income and provincial revenues, and that any provincial treasurer of this province, certainly one in the last extraordinary years, could have done nothing, absolutely nothing, and still have achieved respectable surpluses. In fact, one might ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), apart from having taken up the falling taxes on gasoline and entertainment, did he have to do anything in the last seven years in order to achieve his surpluses. Were they not the function of an extraordinary economic activity of which he was the chief beneficiary?

How different it is at Ottawa and not just with this gobernment. Consider what the hon. Mr. E. N. Rhodes was up against. Consider what Mr. Abbott is going to be up against next week, and then imagine if you will, Sir, how the

economy of this province would be affected if the Minister of Finance were the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) or the hon. Mr. Solon Low. The point is this, that in that jurisdiction, the budget has a meaning, a creative meaning in that it quite properly takes the blame or the credit for such prosperity as it may guide or deflect.

MR. PORTER: And high prices, too.

MR. CALDER: That is a responsibility, of course, which logically follows.

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. CALDER: And which will logically be attacked at the right time.

MR. PORTER: Come clean on that one, too. Take the credit and the blame, too.

MR. CALDER: And when the time comes, it will take action -- which would be an interesting precedent to this government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: When does the time come? When the cost of living is up to 179, then the time comes.

AN hon. MEMBER: You get back in your seat and he will tell you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CALDER: So far as this budget in this province is concerned, the hon. Treasurer (Mr.Frost) is claiming a great deal of credit which he does not deserve.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Hear, hear.

MR. CALDER: Out of the last 11 years, he has had only four that have been normal, the other seven have been extraordinary active.

MR. PORTER: When does the time come to take action on prices in Ottawa?

MR. CALDER: No man here knows that.

AN hon. MEMBER: In the fullness of time.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The hon. member for St. Andrew had better keep quiet. He led you into one trap to-day, do not let him lead you into another one.

MR. CALDER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did not pay those compliments to you in the beginning in order that might discipline your colleagues, but in speaking of the waste of time in the House, I might point out that with great deference to the Ministerial benches, that this "nattering" as they call it in the Navy, takes a good deal of time, even though at times it may be also pleasant.

In addition to the Department in which the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) claims undeserved the credit (that is for the prosperity which has been enjoyed in the province) there is another Department in which they received undeserved credit but they have at least the modesty not to claim it, That is in relation to their conduct of Dominion-Provincial relations. All that has happened, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has relapsed into normality. After a period of curiously entangled Dominion-Provincial relations we have now come back to an era of civilized dealing. We have discovered -- or at least the government has discovered, that Ottawa is in the Province of Ontario and need not be treated as an alien power. And for that, which should be the normal course of events, they have received considerably more credit than is their due.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Well, I don't know, after Drew and "Heppy".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CALDER: Well, I say amongst the number of people who are delighted it is the Right-Honourable Mr. St.Laurent we have to deal with, we may count the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) of this province. I do not ask him to answer this one. What would the situation be if by some unhappy trick of fate, this province had to deal with the hon. Mr. Drew as Prime Minister of Canada --

AN hon. MEMBER: Heaven forbid.

MR. CALDER: -- and then you would have the provinces cut down to lower status and Dominion-Provincial relations would be much less easy to conduct than on their present correct plane.

MR. DENNISON: Would it be as bad as another "Mitch"?

MR. OLIVER: What do you think?

AN hon. MEMBER: Well, we have had some examples.

MR. FROST: We can at least think. You fellows cannot even think.

MR. OLIVER: Is that so? Well, there is not much evidence of it over there, I will tell you that.

MR. CALDER: In 1949, I predicted in my first speech in this House that in two years the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr.Frost) would reach a tax agreement with the Federal authorities. That prediction is in a good way to become true, because it is still a good idea and there is still time for it to be done before this year is out.

Now, when you turn to the constitutional relations like my colleague the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr.Brown),

I have looked over these proceedings on Dominion-Provincial conferences. By far the best parts of the proceedings are not published. Those are the discussions that went on in camera. And I would contribute this, and I am willing to be bound by it in later years, that I think this province, when it comes to a discussion with other provinces and with the Federal people, as to how we are going to amend the British-North America Act, that as far as we need properly go to safeguard provincial interests is to ask for an address of both the Dominion Houses concurred in by any six provinces representing 55% of the total Canadian population.

MR. PORTER: Well, that is pretty close to what we have already proposed.

MR. CALDER: But I am afraid --

MR. PORTER: It is not a new idea.

MR. CALDER: Oh, no, it is not a new idea, but I am asking --

MR. PORTER: We have been doing some pretty clear thinking, too.

MR. OLIVER: It would not belong to you if it was a new idea.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: The Federal position is the same as our own.

MR. CALDER: If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) can control his own people, I could hear what he is trying to say.

MR. FROST: I say the Federal government's position is almost identical with our own.

MR. CALDER: I am not blaming him, Mr. Speaker. I

am directing my remarks more through this government toward other provincial Legislatures which might have fallen into the idea that they are the sole custodians of all provincial feelings, that they alone can be trusted to interpret the positions of their province, and that no other body is able to do so. Of course, it is not, at this moment, an intense difficulty here, but it has been intense and with a change of personalities and with this government, it might become more difficult.

But what we must not lose sight of is, in fairness, that we must not think that M.P.'s, just because they happen to sit in the Federal House, they are any less attached to their native soil than we are, that we are the sole proprietors of all right provincial thinking, that they cease somehow to be provincial men because they sit in a Federal legislature.

MR. DUNBAR: Pretty heavy stuff.

MR. PORTER: For a man who does both Federal and provincial, part time, you know.

MR. OLIVER: It takes a good man to do two jobs.

MR. PORTER: Thank you, thank you.

AN hon. MEMBER: He said "do" two jobs.

MR. CALDER: We will return to that, and the position of the hon. Attorney-General (Mr.Rorter) later, Mr. Speaker, but at the moment I would like to mention quite briefly several items. Last year, it may be recalled, I urged on the consideration of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) a central registry for all motor vehicles in the province. At the time I was speaking, I did not know that the County of York Law Association had

endorsed that proposition and, since half the Bar of Ontario is in this city -- and a very acute Bar -- it seems to me there may have been more in the idea than I knew at that time. Against that, however, I am prepared to admit that the extent of this province bordering on the north five of the American States, makes that proposal as a practical proposition less urgent here than in the American States. But is is still a sound one which I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) and the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) might well continue to study, not just for its commercial aspects only but for the protection of the buying public, cars are going to become, once this war condition has straightened itself away, so common that dealing in them is going to need the most excellent protection that can be given.

Mr. Speaker, there is another item in our budget that I think gives this province perhaps a value far above the money expended. It has been developed in one of my articles and I do not intend to develop it at any great length here, and that is the economical aspect of Monarchy. Sir, we are a monarchy in this province, and for myself, I am an unrestricted monarchist, for many reasons.

AN hon. MEMBER: God Save the King.

MR. CALDER: One reason is the economy of that kind of government.

MR. SALSBERG: More economical.

MR. CALDER: Absolutely more economical.

MR. SALSBERG: He thinks it is cheaper government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member

(Mr. Calder) is not proposing to crown the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), is he?

MR. MacLEOD: We are all in favour of that.

MR. DUNBAR: If I had a ten dollar bill I would put my hand in my pocket and see if it was gone. Sleight-of-hand.

MR. CALDER: When the hon. Premier (Mr.Frost) is speaking to the President of France on Friday, he might inquire of his views on the value of a monarchy as compared to a presidential government.

MR. SALSBERG: He is a Socialist, is he not?

MR. CALDER: But the amount of money this Legislature spent on the maintenance of the monarchial institutions in this province is just chicken feed, literally so.

MR. PORTER: What about "Mitch"?

AN hon. MEMBER: He's gone.

MR. CALDER: Last year there was a provision set up of $14,500. for the Lieutenant-Governor. The same amount of money was spent on chicken feed at the Ontario College of Agriculture. The Estimates are up this year, but you must keep in mind that you are including turkeys in an experiment at O.A.C., you are spending more on the feeding of turkeys and poultry experimentally than you are on the Lieutenant-Governor. I do not say that to discredit the government --

MR. DUNBAR: They have got to have ice cream cones and that, you know.

MR. CALDER: -- or to try to make it appear that they are skimping on this Estimate. I am simply pointing out to the whole House, Sir, that apart from the many other advantages of our form of monarchy, its appeal to a

Treasurer is undeniable.

MR. SALSBERG: It may become tempting to him.

MR. CALDER: I would very much like to develop these other aspects, but not in a budget debate.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Not now.

MR. DUNBAR: Spare us.

MR. CALDER: May I just touch on some of the working conditions in this building. I imagine for one thing it would assist the work of the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) if he had a tiny apartment in which he could hide out, near his office.

MR. PORTER: Haven't you seen it?

MR. CALDER: I think it would assist the work of all hon. members if they had --

MR. PORTER: I am glad you put that in.

MR. CALDER: If they had just cubicles --

MR. DENNISON: Some kind of air raid shelter?

MR. CALDER: Well, even something the size of the present C.C.F. offices. And that I recommend to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett), who I am sure is not deaf to such an appeal. But for all hon. members of this Legislature, particularly private members in the government as well as the Opposition, I do urge that we establish here what they have in many of the United States, and that is a central legislative bureau where a few research people are available to all hon. members of the Legislature to dig up, correlate, to digest and prepare the kind of material, Sir, that any hon. member needs if he is going to make an adequate approach to many technical problems.

(TAKE "FF" FOLLOWS)

FF-1

MR. CALDER: I would not put that bureau under the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: Hear, hear.

MR. CALDER: It should be attached to the Legislative library, but it should be placed under the administration of Mr. Speaker.

MR. DUNBAR: The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) has something there.

MR. CALDER: So that we could be assured of absolutely equal and fair treatment for all hon. members, wherever they may sit in this House.

I have an idea, which I do not even pretend is developed to the point that I am prepared to endorse it, but it is original, and, like any original idea, it needs to be kicked around in order to be worked up into something.

MR. PORTER: We are all prepared to kick it around.

MR. CALDER: Mr. Speaker, let us go at it this way. The idea is to try to do what we can to improve labour relations. It is very fine for us to criticize labour people and say they should be different or to preach at them, which I trust the hon. member from Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) will not do. It is extraordinarily difficult for us within our powers as lawmakers to do anything very useful in that field. Laws can restrict, but they are hard to design to promote action. I think we could get at it in this way: my suggestion is that in order to bring labour

and management together as much as we can, that we exempt from taxation any payment made by a company which that company's union agrees is for the benefit of labour in that company's plant. Le us look at it in this way; each hon. member just needs to call on his imagination, to think of the nearest factory, and he can think of any number of improvements which might be made there in working conditions. There might be better lunch room facilities, more fire escapes, recreation grounds, wash-rooms, showers, -- any number of things. Management so often says,"We would like to do it, but we cannot afford it." That may or may not be true; but,,if management and labour knew that any money expended for such a purpose would be exempted by the Provincial Treasurer from taxation, first of all there you would have a real inducement to people who know what ought to be done to go ahead and do it. If they could not get to-gether, I would not give them the exemption.

MR. PORTER: Would the Federal Government do it?

MR. CALDER: I would urge it on them.

MR. PORTER: Use your influence.

MR. CALDER: You ought to have a certified bargaining agency to ensure that the expenditures are genuinely in the interests of labour, and beyond that I think you ought to have the approval of the Provincial Treasurer, because I can imagine that even these two groups looking at their interests in their plant only might be willing

to endorse a scheme which actually was not in the public interest or could not properly be claimed to come within such an exemption. I think, given those two safeguards, a certified bargaining agency agreeing that the expenditure is for the benefit of their members and the Provincial Treasurer agreeing that that improvement in labour facilities is in the public interest, he should exempt that expenditure from taxation. There you have the rough outline of it. Let us see how that develops under consideration.

MR. FROST: Seven percent is all our tax.,--

MR. CALDER: You might very well have to bonus this.

MR. PORTER: I thought the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) wanted us to economize.

MR. CALDER: There is one place in which you should not economize.

MR. PORTER: We have heard all along the line, there is no place at which we should economize, yet we are supposed to cut. Where are we to cut?

MR. CALDER: When you get more and better work out of the hon. members of the Legislature, you get more for your money. I think you will see that with improved labour conditions, production will increase, and eventually your taxes may increase.

The main thing is that you have a happier plant. If you have to spend money to gain that result, I will not criticize.

MR. THORNBERRY: How about exemption of Union

dues from income tax?

MR. CALDER: Is there any argument about that? Not with me! Mr. Speaker, I could not conclude my remarks, without expressing my disappointment, which has only grown on me in the last day or two, in the Hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter) conception of his office. I must pay the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) the doubtful compliment of putting over this Monday, a most extraordinary resolution on the House, the full drift of which I think has taken a little time for us to appreciate. That is in connection with the Hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter) own committee for the investigation of his own department. I do not say there is anything odd about the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) being the Chairman of a Committee to concern itself with justice.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member for London (Mr.Calder) did not say anything about it at the time.

MR. FROST: The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) voted for it.

MR. CALDER: The point is, Mr. Speaker, that it was only in the one word "Chairman" which was not announced until the very last minute when the resolution was read to the House that the nub of the situation lies. My submission is, that having proper regard for his almost judicial office, and quite apart from the peculiar attention in which the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr.Porter) stands in relation to this inquiry, the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) should not even be a member of this Committee, let alone Chairman.

MR. PORTER: The House has voted in favour of it.

MR. FROST: The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) voted in favour of it.

MR. CALDER: If we have made a mistake, we have to-morrow in which to recant, and the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr.Porter) to save the House a most embarrassing --

SOME HON. MEMBER: It is not too late to recant.

MR. FROST: Was Mr. Conant not the Chairman of the last committee?

MR. CALDER: In 1940; but, under what circumstances?-- altogether different circumstances.

MR. PORTER: This is a motion of the government to go into the whole question of criminal justice. The other committee was to go into civil justice. This is not the investigation of any department. We are going to put all of the affairs of the Department before the Committee.

MR. CALDER: Would the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) say that the genesis of the Conant Committee was at all comparable to the way in which this one has grown up?

MR. PORTER: That was before my time.

MR. CALDER: Mine, also. My recollection is Mr. Conant, himself, without any flurry or controversy, as a matter of improving the administration of his office, asked for this Committee.

MR. FROST: No, he did not. That is not what

happened at all. He started out to abolish grand juries and it created quite a stir in the province. That was the cause of it, to investigate the whole matter. He was the natural man. He was the Attorney-General.

MR. CALDER: The hon. members will recall that last week it was almost an attempt to abolish the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) which brought on this Committee.

MR. PORTER: If I had heard of any such attempt as that, I would have had much more to say.

MR. DUNBAR: There certainly was no flurry from Mr. Conant, nor colour, either.

MR. CALDER: The hon. members will recall an attempt, to dig up recent history in which certain groups within the House were going to challenge the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). At the time he spoke, they had not, so the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) challenged them.

MR. PORTER: They never did.

MR. FROST: Might I ask, did the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) do any challenging? No. The Hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) sat there like a bump on a log and did nothing.

MR. CALDER: Let me remind the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) of the laws of duelling. When the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) challenged the opposition to a duel, the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) gives the challenged party the right

to choose the weapons. I doubt very much if the challenged party ever thought they were going to be in the Committee in which the chief person concerned was going to be Chairman.

MR. FROST: Pure nonsense.

MR. PORTER: As long as I am Attorney-General of this Province, I am the man to be the Chairman of any Committee which has anything to do with the administration of justice.

MR. MacLEOD: Not when the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is charged.

MR. OLIVER: Does the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) think there is anything wrong with his Department?

MR. FROST: No.

MR. PORTER: No. Other people have been going around the country and the leader of the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) has been going around the country with his big mouth --

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: We are going to show him now what is going on.

MR. OLIVER: The only thing I can say is that the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) shows good judgment in taking it seriously.

MR. CALDER: Mr. Speaker, there is a great difference between being the chief person concerned and the chief actor.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member for London (Mr.

Calder) is on the Committee.

MR. FROST: They left the Hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) off.

MR. CALDER: If the thing had developed in that way, I was in the position of the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter). I would not want to be on that committee. I will try to serve the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) on the rental committee.

MR. DUNBAR: Is the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) not on the Committee?

MR. FROST: No.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, what a shame.

MR. CALDER: If the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) had, I think, the same kind of perception of Parliamentary Practice they have in the old country, for example, he would not even wish to be a member of that Committee, as he is the chief person concerned. He could be its counsel, its father-professor --

MR. PORTER: I am, and I am going to be.

MR. OLIVER: The Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) might as well hang himself that way, anyway, as far as we are concerned. Go ahead.

MR. PORTER: Pardon?

MR. CALDER: I ask the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) in the circumstances, whether he can imagine the Minister of Justice at Ottawa setting up a Committee and himself dominating it as Chairman.

MR. FROST: This Committee developed, not because of anything said by the Opposition at all, because the

Opposition said nothing, and, as usual, did nothing. What happened was that the Government stepped in and said "Here, let us have a re-survey of the matters relating to the administration of criminal justice, and particularly with emphasis on gambling, let us have a Committee to look into this and examine the whole problem." The House agreed unanimously. The only thing which happened was that the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) was not put on this Committee group at all, but was left sitting off on the sidelines.

MR. OLIVER: That has nothing to do with it, and the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows it.

MR. FROST: We have another lawyer from Ottawa who was left off, too.

MR. OLIVER: How many lawyers did the government put on?

MR. CALDER: I am happy to assure everyone in this House that so cordial are the relations in this group that there is no doubt about the relations held between the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) and the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) and myself. This is one place where we are not fighting for position.

MR. PORTER: How about the leader?

MR. CALDER: We enjoy his leadership. That has been decided, and we are with him. Can the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) imagine the Hon. Mr. Garson doing such a thing? He has not replied. I

can imagine the Hon. Mr. Duplessis, as Attorney-General for the Province of Quebec, doing such a thing.

MR. FROST: Here we have the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) a learned King's Counsel, sitting in this House, when the motion comes up, here is the whole discussion, thinks it is a wonderful thing and acquiesces in it, the motion is passed, the members are appointed, a week or ten days later he gets up on the floor, starts stuttering and stammering around about that there is something wrong. I ask why did the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) not say something at the time?

MR. CALDER: Let us remember Parliamentary practice. We do not know anything about this motion until the last moment when it is read in the House.

MR. PORTER: Why did the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) vote for it? Does the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) say he has been voting for things he knows nothing about ever since this Session began? I never heard of such an astonishing statement.

MR. MacLEOD: If this had happened in England, the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) would have to resign from office.

MR. FROST: The best precedent in the world is the precedent created here eleven years ago when the then Liberal Attorney-General moved for such a Committee and he sat as Chairman of this Committee, investigating these various subjects.

MR. MacLEOD: Entirely different.

FF-11

MR. FROST: The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) knows he is talking nonsense and rubbish, as usual. The fact of the matter is that there is not one single, solitary charge which was levelled against the Department of the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter).

MR. MacLEOD: He quoted them all, himself, from the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. FROST: I would say that that is about the smallest exhibition I have heard in a long time, coming particularly from the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). I hold the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) on a higher level than some of the nonsense we have been listening to for the last fifteen minutes.

MR. CALDER: When one considers what the government stepped into, that it may be publicly said that the government promoted its own cause, it read the quotations which contained the challenge and then leaped at the challenge, appointed the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) as the chief --

MR. FROST: The Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) was appointed by unanimous vote of the House, including the group of the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder). The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) ought to be ashamed of himself.

MR. PORTER: There was no challenge in this House from the day the House commenced Sessions, until the day the Committee was appointed. No one raised any

question about anything improper, or about anything done not properly by the Attorney-General or his Department. We sat for two months and have not heard a word of it.

MR. FROST: There has not been a word spoken yet in this House of it.

MR. PORTER: They might come into the House and say these things.

(Take GG follows)

GG-1

MR. CALDER: I am pointing out --

MR. FROST: You are getting yourself pretty well down into the gutter.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to make a statement like that --

MR. FROST: This business of making a lot of slimy insinuations, and imputing bad motives should be stopped. If the hon. member (Mr. Calder) has anything to say, let him stand up and make the charges. I object to his making insinuations against people here who are doing a good job for the government. I say it is a cowardly situation, and I use the word used by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) here the other night. It is a shameful thing to do. If he has any charges to make, let him make them, like a man. Let him say what things are happening in this province. But instead of that, he makes vile insinuations of things he thinks are wrong.

There is nothing wrong. The hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) and the government have taken the lead to give this province the very best administration that can be given, and we have asked the House to assist us in doing it. The hon. member (Mr. Calder) should not descend to that sort of tactics.

MR. CALDER: It has been suggested by hon. members nearby that I ask the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) to withdraw such remarks. I will not. I think when calmer moments have returned, you will realize I am not making any insinuations.

MR. FROST: You certainly are.

MR. CALDER: I had got to the point where the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) was challenged --

MR. PORTER: No one has challenged me in this House.

MR. CALDER: He read a quotation from a statement by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and I say that it contained a challenge --

MR. PORTER: No. What I said was that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) made certain statements before this Session to the public, and yet the hon. members of this House have sat here for two months, and the promises he had made to call for a Select Committee as soon as the House met have not been fulfilled, If anybody wanted to know what was going on, and what sort of administration of justice we had, it was about time they had a chance to come forward and see what we are doing. We are prepared to shed the light of day on everything that goes on in the administration of justice in this province. We have sat here for two months, in spite of what people have said outside on the radio, in the press, and so forth, things they would not have said inside the House, and they make statements that are generally three thousand per cent wrong, as we found in the sppech last night. It is suggested here to-night, as the hon. member (Mr. Calder) has said,that charges have been made. There have been no charges made. Nobody dared to make any charges in this House. Nobody has made any charges against me or the administration of justice.

They know they could not, but that things are being carried on fairly, justly and honestly, and they do not dare make any charges.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Here, here.

MR. PORTER: If there is anyone here that thinks we have anything to hide, let him come forward like a man, and say what it is, and stop these hypothetical allusions and insinuations and imputations of this kind. Either stop it or on with it. Which will it be?

MR. CALDER: As an indication of the attitude of the Committee Chairman --

MR. PORTER: What is your charge?

MR. NIXON: Have you your Committee set up?

MR. CALDER: My suggestion is, as a Parliamentarian, he should not be Chairman of that Committee, He might turn it over to the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell), the former Attorney General. He should not be on the Committee at all.

MR. PORTER: Why?

MR. CALDER: Because you are personally concerned.

MR. PORTER: Not a bit. Not a bit. Nobody has made any charges against me. This Committee is not to examine me. As long as I am the Attorney General of this province, if there is a Committee on the administration of justice, I should be the Chairman. If I am not fit to be the Attorney General of this province, then I should not be the Attorney General. And if the hon. member (Mr. Calder) wants to say anything, let him say it like a man, and not make all these insinuations, and

these devious assertions, talking out of both sides of his mouth at the same time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I suggest we let the hon. member (Mr. Calder) continue.

MR. CALDER: In my opinion, that does not correct this situation. It is a demonstration of political acrobatics, and not sound parliamentary practice.

MR. FROST: What nonsense. No question was raised when Mr. Conant was appointed Chairman of a Committee for this very same purpose.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault-Ste.Marie): Mr.Chairman, I suggest this is all out of order.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(PAGE GG-5 FOLLOWS)

MR. JB. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, this is a tense moment indeed for me to rise, --

AN hon. MEMBER: Then sit down.

MR. SALSBERG: If I was to sit down, the hon. member might realize it is worse than my getting up, so he had better be happy with me.

I would very much like to see a calmer spirit prevail for a while, and return to the subject, if it would be at all acceptable to all parties, I would gladly serve as Chairman of that Committee.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: That would relieve the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) of charges, and we would have a very impartial and most thorough investigation of the administration of justice in this province.

As one hon. member said, I leave it to the government to "kick it around" for a while. At any rate, that is the thought.

Mr. Speaker, the debate which is not grinding to a conclusion is, in my opinion, indeed anti-climatic, in that we are discussing how to spend money we have already spent; how to appropriate things we have already appropriated; how to dispose of what we no longer have. Is that right? Of course it is right. There is nothing that will register with the government in an ordinary discussion on the budget, especially in the heat which was generated during the last fifteen or twenty minutes. I am, therefore, inclined to do something I have never done in this House before, and that is to deal with the budget on the background of my own constituency,

the finest in the province. Every hon. member has done it at one time or another; I am the only one who has not. I have come to learn many things about this great province of ours from the speeches which the hon. members from various constituencies have delivered. Mind you, I am not unmindful of their mindfulness of the fact that the local weeklies will pick up this, that, and the other things said about a constituency, but I am also mindful of the fact that there are no local weeklies in my constituency, and the odd weeklies which may exist, will hardly mention anything I am saying tonight. It is, therefore, exclusively for the hon. members who up to now have learned very little about the member for St. Andrew, and I want them to know something about the place I come from and represent.

And in giving that background, perhaps we shall take a look at the Budget, and see how it fits the people there and elsewhere. At any rate, it will be a novel way of tackling the problem.

Let me, therefore, start by assuring you that the constituency of St. Andrew is the most colourful, the most dynamic, the most cosmopolitan, the most interesting, of all ridings in the province. Anyone who doubts that, simply displays ignorance of that constituency, which is something I hope to correct in the next few minutes.

It is the riding where the practical, the mundane and the prosaic mix and mingle with idealism of the highest order, with aims of a very lofty sort, and it all becomes one beautiful pattern of life and struggle as it is reflected in that constituency. St. Andrew is primarily a working class

constituency. The vast majority, if not all its workers are people who earn their livelyhood in work in which they are engaged with their hands or brains, the white-collared people, and so forth. It is a constituency in which a lot of workers own their modest homes; at any rate, they have some title to a piece of property, and all their lives they are engaged in the process of gaining title in full.

Of course, unfortunately, many never achieve that, but they all try, and what is really required by the people of that constituency is required by all the people in this province, and what is good for them, is good for the whole province. It is in regard to what is needed and what is good, that I am speaking tonight.

The riding of St. Andrew is a living United Nations, and when I say "living United Nations", I mean a united nation in the sense of all the people, not just the leaders nor the politicians. There you will find people from every part of the world. The basic population, of course, is Anglo-Saxon. With them, you will find people from all corners of the globe, and you will find one very interesting thing, that these people demonstrate that they can live peacefully side by side, and, furthermore, that they can achieve in a common effort, good objectives, which in the main are the common working class objectives.

(TAKE "HH" FOLLOWS)

which unites the native worker, the man from Scotland, the man from other parts of the world. It is one of the very few areas of this Province -- I regret the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is away because I am sure he knows nothing about that, and he should -- that it is an area which creates a mosaic of Canadian culture, more than any other area, a very colourful contribution of the past, of ancient cultures that were brought over here by people from other parts of the world. That is in St. Andrew and I know by now you are all anxous to be there. Let me tell you this, without prejudice, of a place only about five or six blocks from here, go down there, it is a place, for instance, where are there are more places of worship than anywhere in any constituency. You will find places of worship for practically every known religion in the world. You will find the solid Protestant Churches, big Catholic Churches and Seminaries, you will find Greek Orthodox Churches and many Synagogues and even a Buddist Temple in my constituency and small places of worship for every known denomination and creed that youcan think of. It is all there is the riding of St. Andrew.

You know, in the riding of St. Andrew, the Sabbath is twice a week, for some it starts with sunset on Friday and it continues until the stars appear on Saturday night and for the others, the christians, it starts on Saturday night at midnight and it continues until Sunday night. In fact, I am told there are

groups for whom the Sabbath is Friday in my constituency, and, Mr. Speaker, it is said that every day is a holiday in St. Andrew, and that is not only because they have this hon. member here.

That would be an occasion for celebration from time to time.

There is hardly a day that some group has not the occasion to celebrate a religious holiday, national holidays, patron saints days, the anniversary of an event etc. That is to be found only in the riding of St. Andrew, nowhere else.

MR. BROWN: As their hon. member, do you keep them all?

MR. SALSBERG: As their hon. member, I have a hard time keeping them. Why, Christmas is celebrated twice in St. Andrew, there is the 25th of December as we know it on our calendar, and there are christian groups that celebrate Christmas two week's later according to their calendar.

In the riding of St. Andrew, there are countless numbers of halls and temples that are social and cultural centres for people to cultivate their native cultures. It would be interesting for you to take a walk in St. Andrew on certain nights.

You would find that you could hear narive songs in native tongues sung throughout the riding by people who come from different parts of the world.

There is more cultural activity per square foot in St. Andrew than elsewhere - For instance, very few people would think a girl working in a factory

or in a home if she is Finnish, would, in the evening, blossom out as the leading actress of a dramatic society that is producing drama, or a soloist in the choir singing songs. That is not generally known. You will find people studying the ancient Talmud and the Prophets while others will be reciting poetry of great poets from all parts of the world. And, of course, you will have heated discussions, in literary circles about the latest interpretation of Hamlet or of Bobbie Burns.

There is another unique phenomena in that riding that would be good to carry back to other places, the spirit of fraternalism, of self help and of helping others is developed to a very high degree in that riding. You will find fraternal bodies by the score there, you will find assistance organizations for helping others. That riding is studded with bodies of that sort, all of whom are making a very important contribution to the improvement of their home life and the life of others. I venture to say -- and that is something you might remember, -- that there is more financial giving per person in that riding, than is to be found anywhere. There is hardly a worker who does not give voluntarily to help the needy of the City and those from the old lands who have less.

Of course, nowhere in Ontario will you find this internationalism expressed, even in food. There is no place in this Province where you can get

such a variety of food as you can in St. Andrew. If you do not know it, I will lead you there and you will discover things you never knew. Why, the Viennese never made finer Weiner Schnitzel than they do in that district, and the Hungarian Ghoulash was never as delicious as prepared in St. Andrew, and Ravioli served with ground gorgonzola and what else? Anything your heart desires. In other words, it is little world that you see in that area.

Now, let me tell you that this great constituency is primarily an industrial constituency. As it rises from the lake, it has railroad shops, and it produces almost everything from shoe polish to penicilin. Most of the penicilin is produced there. The main industry of the riding, the economic basis of it all, is something that makes this Province great throughout the country and that is its great garment industry. My friends, St. Andrew is the fashion centre of this country. In fact, we listen and smile when those of another city tell us they too have a fashion centre, I will not mention the town nor will I elaborate on it. I am sure the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) will agree with me that Canada's fashion centre is in St. Andrew. Thousands of working men and women are employed in the garment trades there, and they pool their talent, and their skill to fashion the most beautiful and the most servicable garments that can be produced anywhere in the world. It is in my constituency where they produce

those beautiful minks that some ladies get. I do not think there is one worn in my constituency, but many are made there. It is a constituency that turns out the most expensive items but it also has a long bread-line.

In the process of production, you find the fraternity of men really expressed. You will find in the great garment centre of that riding like nowhere else thousands of Jewish garment workers sitting side by side with tailors from Great Britain, Finnish custom tailors, who are real artists, Japanese men and women, people from the Slavic countries, Negroe men and women, a real mixture of people working in those plants, who all contribute their share to the production of the things that are so wonderful and that reach into every home.

By now, I am sure you are all intrigued by this riding I have the privilege to represent, but that is only an introduction. You see, the riding, like every living thing, has a heart. It throbs and it sends blood out in all directions. The heart of St. Andrew, my friends, is an internationally known street, it's avenue, Spadina Avenue.

Now, some of you may have been led to believe that Fifth Avenue is important and that Piccadilly Square is of significance or that the Champs Elysees in Paris is an important thoroughfare. Well, I suppose they all have their place. I imagine the people that live in those towns think that. But I assure you that there is no comparison, none of them can compare to this borad,

throbbing, full of life thoroughfare, known as Spadina Avenue which is the heart of my constitutency. You seek Spadina Avenue has a tempo all its own, and if you are up there for a while you begin to feel that tempo, it is a tempo of creativeness that never stops. Unlike farming, which, of course, is is an exacting and demanding occupation, or steel production or other items, it is not stationary and it is not the same. When one season's product is planned, another has begun, it never stops, it cannot rest on its laurels. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) feels it, he know that is so. There is a certain creative furvour that pulsates throughout the street and finds its reflection in every phase of life there.

(TAKE "II" FOLLOWS)

Now, this creativeness that is responsible for many things in your homes. You have just came back from your Easter vacation, and many of you got up Easter morning and saw your boy or girl coming downstairs, wearing their new things, and you thought: "My, they look as pretty as pictures, don't they?" You thought so. Undoubtedly they were and, as parents, you undoubtedly took pride in them. Well, undoubtedly you deserve a lot of credit and are justified in taking pride, but you would be amazed how much Spadina Avenue contributed to making them look as they do in your eyes. You would be amazed how much, where and to what extent, that Spadina has made its contribution. Why, the suits you wear, if they are good, come from Spadina.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: The bonnet you bought for grandama for Easter was made in Spadina--it is a nice one. The cap, fur lined for grandfather for Winter, if you bought it for him for Christmas, was made in Spadina. The gowns that are worn by Mr. Speaker and the Clerk are made around Spadina.

Mind you, when demands are made on you at home your wife and daughter want this and want that and she shows you the beautiful things, you may at such moments not think kindly of Spadina, but after you buy them and they wear them, you will like Spadina because Spadina makes it so you cannot help it, once you have acquired what they produce.

Now then, there is an intersection on that street, Spadina and College, which is unlike anything else, not only in this unique riding but anywhere in Canada. Some people are amazed when they come there to find one restaurant after nother for an entire block. But you do not realize that this is the essence of the heart, that is where people come to

when everything is done. You would be amazed at what you find there. It is not a boulevard cafe as you see in some Paris Streets. You can, in one of those restaurants in the evening, get more on world affairs, on Korea, on international politics, than in many universities. You can at one table hear a discussion of what is going to happen in Korea, that will really be an eye-opener to you.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the latest on it?

MR. SALSBERG: No one questions their wisdom. If you do, they look at you as if to say, "Look, he is asking how we know. Why, we know." And it is true, the people there know. It is the one corner in this country where people by the hundred wait for the morning newspapers to come so they will find out the latest events in the world. It is a corner where people buy the best magazines in the world -- well, I mean, in America, not just trash, although I imagine there is some of that. Magazines of opinion are sold in stacks on the corners. Hon. members of this House should go down and see that.

Now it is true that in addition to all this, and I am told you can on that corner also get the pedigrees of the horses running at Saratoga -- so I am told, I do not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: I never heard of it. I did hear people discuss the latest play put on by the

Belmont Theatre Group which won the prize as the best amateur theatrical group, also in my riding. I have heard discussions on the latest Shostakovitch symphony and of a new Oratorio that a choir is preparing. And I have heard them discussing trade union problems and I heard them discussing the evils of this government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: Imagine that.

AN hon. MEMBER: Who told them? Do you know?

MR. SALSBERG: That street, however, has a great history and it has made labour history. You should know that, too. If you wonder, sometimes, how and why I'm here you will understand it better if you follow what I am about to tell you since some of you may wonder how I got here.

AN hon. MEMBER: We do.

MR. SALSBERG: That is right. Well, after I will tell you, you will not wonder any more, although you should not have wondered by now. You see, that street is the heart of the garment industry, and for many years the conditions of the workers in that industry were horribly bad. It is an industry that requires in the main, very little capital to get going. You do not need millions to commence, and the result is that you have many small production units.

In the old days competition was very keen and it was at the expense of the

workers. You have heard the expression "sweat shops". That is where they existed. In England they spoke of the sweat shop in the old days when "Song of the Shirt" was written that was sung in labour halls for a couple of generations.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Something else for Spadina?

MR. SALSBERG: An hon. member (Mr. Brown) shows an advertisement and says, "That is something else on Spadina". Everything is on Spadina.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: In those areas, men and women employed in that industry would not earn enough to support themselves. The percentage of tuberculosis was very high, the hours were endlessly long and the result was that the workers in that industry around that area formed unions in the early days, and were engaged of necessity in bitter struggles year in and year out. The formation of unions was a thing of heroism. The industry from which I come had to battle for years before it got recognition and established itself. A 12-hour day was very common and there was homework the people were engaged in after a 12-hour day; they carried bundles home so that their families helped them. And all that was necessary to keep the most minimum of living standards.

And so there were many sanguine battles on that street, fights galore. There was no way out. It was either that or what the people called "slavery".

So labour history was made. Powerful unions were established. It took years of struggle for them to be established, to be accepted, not to be fought every spring season and every fall season, not to have to go through the whole process of reorganizaing themselves every year.

Class consciousness of course embedded itself in the minds and the hearts of those workers, as it did among the workers of the British Isles, and for the same reason. No miracle, nothing conjured up; it was the struggle for life that made these people class-conscious. It was their experience with governments, and with the police, that caused them to question and to turn perhaps earlier than many other labour groups, towards independent political thought. It is not accidental that "Jimmy Simpson" carried on his work in the early days in that area. It was natural.

And so you find in Spadina, in addition to everything else, the centres of the trade unions; the labour lyceum, the central office of the steel union, the halls of the United Garment Workers and of other groups.

And I suggest it is very, very exciting to go down to the Garment Centre at five o'clock, and see thousands upon thousands of men and women flow out of these huildings.

The street become filled with them, and you see a mingling of people like nowhere else. You hear tongues spoken that you hear nowhere else in

Ontario. People of all races and colours and creeds come out from the same work shop, and they go home and they live in the same street, even in the same houses. And there you find in that whole area an element of the brotherhood of man being formed, and the people living together, though they come from so many diverse areas.

In the evenings, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, there is nowhere else in this Province that you could see the spirit of brotherhood displayed better than you do in that riding, in the labour halls. There you will seeaa Japanese man and a Negro working, and a Jew and a Slav, sitting at a meeting presided over by a Scotchman. And they will address each other as "Brother" and "Sister". And they mean it that is the form of address at those meetings -- "brothers and sisters." It is that sort of speech you will find in that area. Now, what do such people want? Having given you some idea about that constituency, what do they want? They want, of course, an opportunity to live, which is the first requirement of all people. They want peace. They want peace for themselves and their people, and they come from countries, many of them, who have suffered terrible destruction. There is hardly a house in the major part of that area that has not lost some of their sons in various parts of the world, and they do not want, for the sake of those who are left alive, another war to take place. It is not an academic question with them. It is personal.

It is immediate for them here and for those they have left behind.

They want an opportunity to earn a living to provide a decent living standard for their family. Education is placed on a very high level there. The parents in my constituency would sacrifice essentials of life to give their children a chance to be educated.

They want, therefore, wages that will provide a decent living standard. They want the aged people taken care of, the old people to live in dignity and self-respect and in a minimum of comfort in their declining years.

AN HON. MEMBER: A minimum?

MR. ALSBERG: They want a clearance of the slum areas -- because there are slums in my riding. In the lower part there are areas that should have been cleared years ago. They want an opportunity to own a home in which they will live. They want labour laws that will make it unnecessary for them to repeat the battles of the past, that will guarantee collective bargaining and the rights of their union. That is the kind of law they want; they want social legislation that will make life more secure.

They, of course, are opposed to all forms of discrimination. They want equality in the fullest sense of the word for everybody. That is why the demand for legislation to outlaw discriminatory practices came so strongly from those areas.

II-8

Mr. Speaker, on that background, the background of what is needed by the people of St. Andrew, let us now see how the Budget fits. Does it meet their requirements, or does it not? I am afraid that it does not. I know that the government has its chest thrown out and it wants medals to be pinned on it for having given larger amounts here and there, and I know that they are ready to receive bouquets and they think they deserve them. They have given free books, they have given more money for hospitalization and so on, but in my opinion it is nothing to ask credit for and to get medals and ribbons for.

(Take JJ follows.)

After all, all this government has done is to return to the people a portion of the vast amount it has taken from them in the form of taxes. Let there be no mistake about it, the government has introduced new taxes. It is not correct to say they have not. They have increased the taxes. All they are doing is returning a portion of the money which has been given to them, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has coined a phrase which he uses, and which others have used, when he says he "likes to deal with the human resources". Well, measured by the yardsticks of "human resources", this government will be found wanting by the people of my constituency, and people of similar constituencies throughout the province.

Let us see about that. On old-age pension, despite the last surpluses, the government has done nothing. I have spoken about this many times, and I do not want to repeat, but you are negotiating with Ottawa; you are hoping; you are trying; in the meantime, the old-age pensioners are expected to exist in the large centres on $40. a month. That is impossible; this government has failed in its most essential responsibility to that section of the population.

Mothers' allowances: you have not done as well in the treatment you have given these women and their children as other provinces, even with the increase you have now allotted to them.

In regard to Day Case Centres: you have failed the working mothers in my riding, and others like it. They know this government has failed; they have to go to work, and have nowhere to leave their children to be looked after.

In regard to the unemployables; this government

refuses, so far, to budget anything in that great riding of mine for the unemployables. Every morning at 10 o'clock a line is formed at the Scott Mission, near SpadinaCrescent, stretching back into the Crescent itself, of men waiting for a bowl of soup, a line which has been forming since last Fall, and continuing today, and this government cannot say that it has done everything in the light of "human resources" when it has failed to extend any assistance to this people, But forcing men to stand in line, waiting for a bowl of soup. This government has failed this riding of mine and others, in regard to the price of milk. You promised that the price of milk would be frozen, and that promise has been broken, a promise that was heard throughout the province.

In regard to housing: the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), when he was Minister of Planning and Development six years ago said there will be no slums left in this province in ten years. Six years of those ten have gone by, and the slums are worse than they were six years ago, and not a single house has been built in my constituency, as the result of anything this government has done.

In regard to the physically incapacitated: there have been a large number of speeches made about this, but so far, nothing done. I have a man in my riding who are arthritics, who cannot work, but there is no allowance for them, and they come to me and ask "is there not some pension for men like us; we are not 70 years of age; we cannot get the old-age pension and one cannot work", and I have to tell them "No, there is no such fund".

I say, Mr. Speaker, in the background of the needs

of the people in my constituency, and using that as a yard-stick, we must conclude that the Budget is not a budget which meets the needs of the people.

It does not. You see, in my constituency, people take their politics seriously. Their politics is not a game; they take it very, very seriously. Politics are alive in that constituency, because politics decide whether they will be affected in the days of a depression or not. Politics decide whether they are to have the "gag" on, or whether it will be taken off. Politics in that constituency are the determinating factor as to whether the children will have a chance to go to school or not. Politics, therefore, is very close to the people, and I am sure that these politically-developed people in my riding, and in other ridings,-- whether you come to them in May or September -- will not love you in May, and will not love you in September.

Hon. Charles DALEY (Minister of Labor): Would this be a good time to interrupt?

MR. SALSBERG: When I am true, I will be glad to answer all your questions.

MR. DALEY: I do not want to ask a lot of questions, but if you will permit me, I may say that tomorrow I am having dinner with those very people of whom you speak, and I hope they will have some of those exotics dishes you mentioned, and I would like to say to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that I do not think there is any group of people any place which have profited by or been benefitted more from the activities of this government in connection with the Industrial Standards Act, and other

pieces of legislation, which have lifted that most wonderful industry of which you speak from the gutter, in which you claim it was, with the sweat shops, and so forth. These things do not exist any longer; they do not exist because there has been good Labor Laws in this country, and I would say that as far as I am personally concerned, I do not think there is ever a large gathering in that very area to which I am not invited. I feel that the contributions that this government has made are very well appreciated by them. If you have any doubt about that, ask Mr. Fetterman, or Mr. Spivak, and see if what I say is not justified.

MR. SALSBERG: As far as it is possible for me to use my influence, I will see that you are provided with the dishes you mentioned. As far as going to the people you mentioned is concerned, they are, to the best of my

C.C.F-ers, and they may not want to answer me, because they know I will repeat it in public, but to the best of my knowledge, they are very active in the C.C.F.

MR. DALEY: The other people you mentioned are very appreciative.

MR. SALSBERG: That is fine. The laws have certainly improved conditions in many fields, of course, but I want to assure the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) after the thing which has driven out the sweat-shop conditions is the unions, the militancy of the unions, who have fought to correct those conditions, resulting in certain laws which were eneacted recently, and some which were enacted when the first Liberal government came in, under pressure of the Labor

movement, which eliminated some of the evils, as evidenced by the Industrial Standards Act, and so forth.

But when you come to the people of my riding, and I think it is true in all the working class areas, and you tell them you have done everything possible, they will point to the slums and the soup lines at Spadina and College Street, and they will turn away from you and say "Look! and they say they have given us everything".

When you say you have given them the best labor legislation in the world, they will scratch their heads and turn away.

A critic of this government said it was in a coma for seven years. I do not think that is true, because I think this government should be held responsible for a lot of things they did not do, and must accept responsibility for its deeds, or lack of them.

I disagree with Mr. Thomson. I do not think the government is in a coma; but the Budget shows it is not for working people like those who make up the majority of my riding. They send representative here to prod the government, to push the government, to embarrass this government in order to get those concessions, those improvements which are absolutely necessary for the welfare of the people. Only under a Labor Farmer Government -- which I think will come -- representing the majority of the working people in the country and the cities, will this province be transformed into the land of milk and honey, of which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has spoken in the past.

That day will never come under a Tory

administration, and will never, never come under a Liberal administration. Only under a Labor Farmer Government, will it become a land of milk and honey for the people, a land of security in which all people will work for the common good. For that will be a government which will have its roots amongst the people, in the farms and factories, and the areas where the working people are living. That day undoubtedly will come. Until that day arrives, I believe it will send representatives of the type they have sent from St. Andrew to continue the good work, tc ather with others, like the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and those who came from other such constituencies to carry the battle of the people into the Legislature.

I conclude with an invitation to all of you. If you want to feel the pulse of the people, come to the most colourful, the most interesting, the most creative, and the most politically-developed constituency in the province. Come with me to St. Andrew, and I will be happy to take you to the heart of that constituency, to Spadina Avenue and College Street, at five o'clock in the afternoon, we will go down to the Garment Centre and there you will not only meet and see the people, but you will really begin to feel the pulse of the people of this province and perhaps you will be more responsive to their needs.

(TAKE "KK" FOLLOWS)

KK - 1

HON. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to a lot of speaches in the House and I think that I can credit myself with being rather attentive in most cases. I would say to the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that I have never listened to a speach which I considered more interesting. I suggested the other day that the hon. members should discuss their ridings and tell us about things.

There was one thing which confused me. The hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) spoke about the wonderful relationships of the races, creeds and colour. This is a fact which confused me. This Government is endeavouring to spread that throughout the Province by education, by various methods, to induce our people to be more tolerant and this afternoon on the third reading, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) voted against it. How does the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) account for that?

MR. SALSBERG : I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) not to try and be funny, because that will be a joke. If he is speaking for the sake of new supporters, in my riding may I assure the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) that even Tory supporters in my riding are politically far more developed than to accept that for anything else than a joke. They will laugh. Besides that, Mr. Speaker has the matter under consideration, and, like the Hope Report, must rule out any discussion.

MR. DALEY: I must admit I think you thought

MR. DALEY; I must admit I think you thought you were trapped.

MR. SALSBERG: I am appreciative of the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) remarks about my humble speech. I shall be very glad to be your host in my constituency, together with all hon. members and let us come and see the most interesting constituency in Ontario.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) made a very interesting speech, indeed; at least, I thought it very interesting.

I would like to say, before I ask the leader of the Liberal Group (Mr. Oliver) to move the adjournement of the debate, that all or most of this has happened, in the last seven years under this Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear.

MR. FROST: Never has there been such progress in the history of this Province, since its foundation in 1872, as has taken place in the last seven years.

The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has intimated that he would like to address the House, and, if he would move the adjournment of the debate, I will make the --

MR. OLIVER: What about the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Dowher)?

MR. FROST: I understood the hon. member

for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) was to address the House next.

MR. OLIVER: It does not make any difference to me.

MR. Speaker, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I find we have four other speakers. There is a speaker from the Liberal Group, from this side, to be followed by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the reply of the Government before the vote. It is now 10.30 p.m. of the clock. It seems to me that we are so well ahead with our work that insteadof going ahead tonight, we might meet to-morrow morning, as there are no Committees meeting, at 10.30 of the clock, adjourn at noon, meet at two of the clock and have the wind-up speeches, the votes and the formal proceedings. If the House would be agreeable to that I would be prepared to so move.

To-morrow morning there will be the speaker for the Liberal Group (Mr. Oliver) and there would be the speach of the member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer) in whatever order they agree upon. There is also a Bill I promised to take up which stands in the name of the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck). That might not take the time fully from 10.30 until a quarter after twelve. If

we are finished before that, the House can adjourn until two of the clock and we will have the formal proceedings and wind up the affairs of the Session.

That is rather a change in proceedings. I would not do that unless the hon. members of the other groups thought it was desirable.

MR. OLIVER: Quite alright.

MR. JOLLIFFEE: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I think that will be alright.

MR. FROST: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I will move, seconded by Doucett, that when the House adjourns this sitting thereof, it stand adjourned until 10.30 of the clock tomorrow morning, rise at 12.00 o'clock for lunch, and adjourn until two of the clock, and that the provisions of Rule number two of the Assembly be suspended as far as they may apply to this motion.

MR. FROST: I move the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House at adjourned at 10.37 of the clock p.m.

THIRD SESSION

of the

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

of the

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

- - - - - - - -

TORONTO, ONTARIO, APRIL 5th, 1951, et seq.

- - - - - - - - - -

VOLUME XLIII

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1951.

(MORNING SESSION)

- - - - - - - - - -

HON.(Rev.)M.C. DAVIES, - Speaker

R.C. STURGEON
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
TORONTO

A-1

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

MR. W. MURDOCH(Essex South): Mr. Speaker I beg leave to present the report of the Select Committee appointed to study the indemnities and allowances to members of the Legislative Assembly and members of the executive council, and move its adoption.

CLERK-ASSISTANT:

8 "To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Ontario:

Honourable Members:

The Select Committee of the Assembly appointed on April 6th, 1950, 'to study and inquire into the payment of indemnities and allowances to Members of the Legislative Assembly and members of the Executive Council and all matters pertaining thereto', begs leave to present the following as its report:

The Committee met on the 13th day of December, 1950, and on the 27th of March, 2nd of April and 3rd of April, and 4th of April, 1951.

The Committee gave consideration to the indemnities and allowances provided in other Provinces of Canada and also to the report of

a Committee which reported on the same matters on the 10th March, 1947. In this connection, it may be pointed out that the recommendations of the Committee of 1947 were not fully implemented by the legislation which followed it.

After due deliberation, the Committee came to the conclusion that the salary and expense allowance at present paid to the Speaker of the Assembly, to members of the Executive Council and to Members of the Legislature, are inadequate when considered in the light of the following conditions:

1. The expansion of Government services and legislation affecting all Departments now makes membership in the Legislature practically a full-time occupation. The gross ordinary expenditure of the Province has more than doubled since 1946 and as a result the duties of a Member have greatly increased from year to year.
2. The increase in the work of Government has made it necessary to lengthen the Sessions of the Legislature substantially, thus entailing a greater expense for the members.
3. The desirability of making it possible for citizens to become candidates for

election, even though they may not possess sufficient private means to enable them to devote full time to their duties as Members of the Legislature.

4. The mileage allowance to Members for travelling from their homes to Toronto and return for one trip only during the year is quite inadequate in view of the number of visits each Member must make to the seat of Government during any year.

The Committee has considered the present salary and allowances paid to the Speaker of the Assembly, which, at present, consists of his salary and expense allowance as a Member plus an allowance of $2,500 a year. The Committee is of the opinion that this allowance is not sufficient to reimburse the Speaker for the expenditures incurred by him in carrying out the extensive duties of his office and accordingly recommends that in addition to his salary and expense allowance as a Member of the Assembly, the Speaker be paid an additional indemnity of $3,000 per year and an expense allowance of $2,000 per year, such payments to be exclusive of any sum placed to his credit in the Estimates for entertainment purposes.

The Committee recommends that the Members

of the Executive Council be requested to draw the full salary authorized by Statute, rather than the reduced amount presently drawn by them.

The Committee further recommends:

1. That there be paid to each Member of the Assembly:

   (a) A salary of $[illegible],[illegible]0 per year.

   (b) An allowance for expenses of $1,300 per year.

   (c) A mileage allowance of ten cents per mile for four trips each year, based on the distance between his home and Toronto.

The Committee recommends that this report receive consideration at the beginning of the 1952 Session.

(Signed) William Murdoch, Chairman,
Bryan L. Cathcart
William J. Grummett
Alexander A. MacLeod
Harry C. Nixon
Charles E. Rea."

Motion agreed to.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, is that a unanimous report of the Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: I am advised that it is a majority report.

MR. MacLEOD: I think the names of all the hon.

members of the Committee were read out. Did all the hon. members of the Committee sign the report or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The names of all the members have been typed in and four members' names have been signed on the report.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, does that mean that one hon. member of the Committee is not concurring in the report?

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): There must be two.

MR. SPEAKER: Would you like me to read out the names?

"William Murdoch, Bryan L. Cathcart, William J. Grummett, Alexander A. MacLeod, Harry C. Nixon, Charles E. Rea."

The signed names are:

"William Murdoch, Bryan L. Cathcart, Alexander A. MacLeod, Harry C. Nixon."

No signature by William J. Grummett and Charles E. Rea.

MR. MURDOCH: Mr. Speaker, I understood Mr. Rea was going to sign, last night.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused at the report. Does the absence of the signature of two members of the Committee indicate non-concurrence, or is it simply inadvertence that they did not have an opportunity to sign the report?

MR. W. U. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Non-concurrence, so far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The statement of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) is non-concurrence on his part, which makes it a majority report but not unanimous.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is improper for me to ask if there is a reason sentimentally for the non-concurrence of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett).

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I have not signed the report for the simple reason that I did not agree with the last clause the Chairman of the Committee has added to the report, that is, that no effect be given to the report until after the beginning of the next Session. We, as a Committee, were appointed to do a job. That job was to bring in a report bearing on the indemnities of the hon. members. I do not think it was our job to suggest legislation. I do not care what the Government does with the report after it is brought in and presented. The Government could put it on the shelf, as they have done with many other reports, or, the Government could deal with it at this Session or the next session of the House. It is not the duty of the Committee to make a suggestion as to when the report will be implemented. That is, in effect, we, as members of this Committee, are taking on our shoulders, perhaps, the blame from the back benches here in the House. I know that for some considerable time the back benchers have been expecting a report to be brought in. They appointed us to do a

job. If we pass this and recommend that this report be implemented only after the beginning of the next Session, then we are taking a responsibility which belongs to the Cabinet. It was the duty of the Cabinet, when the report was presented, to say whether or not there would be brought in any legislation at this Session or the next. That is not our duty, that is not our responsibility. I do not wish to have resting on my shoulders any blame from the back benchers of this House that I have delayed or held up in any way the implementing of the report. We finished our job when we arrived at a decision as to what the indemnities and allowances should be. We then should have handed over to the Government this report as it stood and left it with the Government to deal with it. Another matter is that this Committee was appointed at the Last Session of the Legislature to sit between the Sessions of the Legislature to consider this question. On several occasions I made inquiries as to when the Committee would sit. At the time the Committee was appointed an omission was made in that no Chairman of the Committee was named in the appointment. Those of us who were named to the Committee saw this omission shortly after the appointment, conferred among ourselves -- at least, four or five of us did -- and we decided it would be left to the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch) to act as Chairman and call the Committee. After making other inquiries I thought that the Committee was

making no progress. I decided "This is another Committee which is going the way of several others of this House during the past eight or ten years."

However, on the 13th day of December, the Committee was called together. We held a short meeting at that time. This House opened on Feb.1st. From the 1st day of February until the 27th day of March, I believe it was, nothing was done. This Committee could have commenced its sittings on the 2nd or 3rd of February, and this report could have been presented to this House within a day or two after the House opened. Nothing was done until the dying hours of this Session of the Legislature. For that reason I felt that this Committee was held back and no report made, so that no action would be taken or no responsibility assumed by the Government. That was one of the reasons why I refused to concur in the report.

I am in agreement with the rest of the hon. members of the Committee on the findings, but, on this additional section providing for the time when the report is to be implemented, I am in opposition.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) has given a very frank, fair statement of his position, which I think would answer the question of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). I think the report might be received.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker,

I must say that as a member of the Committee I was rather hopeful the report just made by the Hon. Chairman of the Committee would be a unanimous report. I am glad, since the signature of the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) does not appear on the report, that the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) has seen fit to make a frank statement at to the reason the hon. member did not concur.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should let it go at that, because this Committee and its findings have a history which I think should be known to the hon. members of this House.

I may say that when this Committee was set up a year ago, great stress was laid on the desirability of having that Committee representative of all groups in this House. As a matter of fact, quite a demonstration was made on that point. I agreed to serve on the Committee because I found myself in agreement with the suggestion made, I believe, by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that any study of this problem should be on non-partisan lines and that no two or three groups in the House should accept responsibility for deciding a matter of this sort.

When the Committee had its first meeting in December and began to consider the recommendations of an earlier Committee, I, and I believe I alone, took the position that any recommendations our

Committee agreed to make to this Assembly should only be operative following a general election. I did not feel that it was proper that the Committee or the hon. members of this Assembly should assume responsibility for increasing their own indemnities. We should make a finding, we should express an opinion on this question, but that our recommendations and opinions should be taken into consideration by the next government of the province of Ontario, whether that Government takes office next year or the year after. However, at later meetings, we went into the matter a little more fully. I was prepared a day or two ago to sign the report and to agree with the recommendations provided no date for implementation was specified. The hon. members of the Committee were agreed on it several days ago but later the three hon. members of the Committee took the position that it would be better to include in the report a recommendation that the increases should not take effect until after a general election. When that proposal was made, I pointed out that if such a motion were put before the Committee I, in the circumstances, would support that, because that was the original view I had. However, I said that I thought it would be much better if the Committee were to make a unanimous report. Therefore, I moved a motion to the effect that the recommendations of the Committee should receive consideration at the beginning of the Session of 1952. I was hopeful that

all the hon. members of the Committee would agree with that, so that our report would be unanimous.

The hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett), in his wisdom, did not see fit to go along with me on that; but I think it is rather important to take note of the fact that the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) does not agree with the recommendations, that his non-concurrence is simply based on the fact that the recommendations are not to take effect as of now. As I understood him, he wants it implemented at once.

HON. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Mr. Speaker, much earlier in the Session, when Mr. Speaker was not in the Chair, but when the House was in Committee of Supply, I made my protest to the House, as the hon. members will recall, that it was impossible to get this Committee to meet. As the hon. members have said, we had one meeting in December. It was clearly understood then that the necessary subsequent meetings would be held in time for this Session of the House to give consideration to our recommendations. Week followed week, and every time I met the Chairman of the Committee in the House I protested that we were not meeting. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I think, agreed with me that the Committee should meet and hand in its report as early as possible so that the House, itself, and particularly the Government, which, in the final analysis only, has the authority to bring in money bills and provide the

necessary estimates, should consider the report. Instead of that, one delay followed another until we found ourselves in the position yesterday where it was impossible with the mechanics available to give the report consideration this Session. In view of that and the desirability, as I thought, of making a unanimous report, if at all possible,

I signed this recommendation, including that the report be given consideration at the beginning of the next Session of the House.

(Take B follows.)

I want to assure you, Sir, that it was no fault of mine that these delays followed to such an extent that it was impossible during the present Session to give consideration, with a view of carrying out the recommendations, if such were the policy of the government. I indicated my attitude many weeks ago, as Hansard will show, when the House was in Committee of Supply, and it will bear me out in that.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to clear up what might be a wrong impression left by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). He rather indicated in his remarks that I refused to sign the report due solely to a quarrel with the time the findings would be implemented by the government. That is not the fact. My quarrel is the fact that we took upon our shoulders some responsibilities which did not properly rest there, but which rested with the government, to put this increase into effect, and it was not for us to assume to give the government an "out" and say: "We cannot do anything, because this is a recommendation of the Committee".

I plainly stated in Committee, and I want it emphatically understood here, that I do not care a rap when the government puts the implementation into effect, this Session, or the next Session, or three or four Legislatures hence. The thing I am concerned about is that the hon. members of the House will not place upon my shoulders any responsibility for the delay.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Report has been adopted.

Motions.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker,

I move, seconded by Mr. Dunbar:

"That a Select Committee of this House be appointed to inquire into all matters affecting leaseholds and rentals in the Province, with special reference to Wartime Leasehold Regulations as defined in Bill No. 133, "An Act to provide for the Regulation of Leaseholds", and to include in their report any recommendations for the improvement thereof considered advisable.

The Committee to have authority to sit during the interval between Sessions and shall have full power and authority to call persons, papers, and things, and to examine witnesses under oath, and the Assembly doth hereby command and compel the attendance before the Committee of such persons and the production of such papers and things as the said Committee may deem necessary for any of its proceedings or deliberations, for which purpose the Honourable the Speaker may issue his warrant or warrants.

The said Committee to consist of seven members and to be composed as follows:-

Hon. Mr. Cecile, Chairman,
Messrs. Calder, Cathcart, Dowling,
Park, Porter and Sandercock.

In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of the Committee the vacancy shall

be filled by the appointment of a member on the recommendation of the leader of the party to which the former member belonged."

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Frey South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) in regard to the method to be employed to fill a vacancy, if one occurs. Is this procedure an innovation, or are there precedents for it?

MR. PORTER: I do not think it has ever occurred before. I do not know of any precedent which is being followed here. It is simply, however, following out the power which this Assembly has to govern the actions of any Committee, and to provide for any contingency of that kind, which the hon. members of this House may desire, in what may be considered the best interest of the proceeding.

MR. OLIVER: The thing that struck me -- and I think the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) will appreciate it -- is that a case might arise where the three government members might be retired and a new slate brought in, and you are quite at liberty to do that, under this motion. Should there not be some reason given for the vacancy. It if was on account of death, of course, that is all right, but this says that for any reason at all the member or members may be replaced.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the genesis of this was because the Select Committees of the House set up last Session found it was not possible to call the Committee for many months

due to the absence of one of the members. You can easily understand that such absence might arise from one of many reasons. Suppose, for example, the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) should go to the Privy Council on one of those deferred cases and be away for very many months; it might be desirable to ask the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) to nominate someone in his stead. That situation probably would not arise except for the fact that this is a very small Committee, composed of only seven members. This seems to be a reasonable arrangement. I cannot imagine that any of the parties in this House would lend themselves to the switching around of this Committee for any other purpose than a situation which would arise causing a member's unavoidable absence, by reason of illness, or business, or something of that sort, which would make it impossible for him to sit on the Committee.

MR. OLIVER: Is the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) sure of the legality of that?

MR. PORTER: It has been considered.

MR. OLIVER: It seems to me there would be an element of doubt as to whether the Legislature could delegate to a Committee the right of the Committee to change the membership, either to increase or decrease it.

MR. PORTER: The advice is the Legislature has full power; it is a sovereignty with all powers under its own jurisdiction. Of course, the matter may never arise. If it does arise, and an attempt is made to carry out that proposal, if anybody wants to contest it at that time, I suppose he may. I do not know that there is any other statutory way of going about it. If a vacancy does occur,

and a substitute member is nominated, according to this Resolution, if any question is raised, it could be dealt with, but I am advised it is quite within the powers of the Assembly.

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I am not an authority on constitutionality, but my impression is this is strictly unconstitutional. I do not see how this Supreme Tribunal of the people of Ontario can delegate its power with respect to membership on a Committee with such a frail instrument as political parties. Inasmuch as there is no precedent for this action, I certainly think the matter should be reconsidered.

There is nothing in the motion to suggest the reason which would cause a member to cease to be a member of a Committee, and as the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Oliver) has said, there is nothing to prevent any of the members of the present Committee withdrawing and leaving the public represented on this Committee free to name an entirely new set of members.

The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) said there has been consultations on some of these points, but he does not say with whom. We should like to know on whose advice he makes that statement, and I suggest that if this action, was challenged in the Courts, the decision would be against the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) as far as this motion is concerned.

That is the first point I want to make.

Secondly, I wonder why the Exclusion Act applies to this motion. This is the second or third time Select

Committees have been set up during this Session which have been confined to three groups in the House, and that, of course, is unconstitutional.

MR. PORTER: If the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) is right in his first point, he must be wrong in this one. He is getting himself tied up in too much of a knot.

MR. MACLEOD: I point out that last year when the Select Committee on Indemnities was appointed, we were not excluded from that Committee; we were even courted to make sure we were on the Committee, because apparently the government and other parties in the House did not want to leave anybody on the outside of that one -- just in case. Great point was made of the fact that it was an all-party affair.

I am not prepared to argue that a small group like this should be represented on all Committees. That is not the point at all. But I am wondering why we were left off the Committee on Lands and Forests, which we suggested in the first place; we were excluded from that; we were excluded from the Standing Committee dealing with the reports of government Commissions; we were excluded from the P.P.P. Committee, and now on this last day of the Session another Committee is set up, in which we are interested, and we represent two very important urban ridings, and I think if the Committee is going to consist of seven members, we might have a place on that. After all, the Select Committee on Indemnities only has six, and we were one of the six. I do not know why the Attorney General (Mr. Porter) is so anxious to keep us off. We have served on Select Committees

in the past, and I think we have been helpful; we have been the peace makers; we have been the ones who have tried to keep these Committees together, and I ask my friend the hon. Attorney General (Mr.Porter) to re-consider this matter, and give us representation on the Committee.

MR. FROST: Before the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) replies, I should like to address myself to the second point raised by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). This, of course, raises a difficult point in the organization of Committees of the Legislature in a House, such as this. I may say that constitutionally we have, of course, one party in Opposition, we have a Leader of the Opposition, my friend opposite, of course, occupies that position (Mr. Jolliffe).

Actually, from a standpoint of organization of the House, and organization of Committees, there is nothing to say that any group other than the official Opposition should be recognized. I think that is true.

On the other hand, we have endeavored to meet the situation. We have three Opposition groups and we have always endeavored to do the best we could to meet that situation. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) will see the point. Here we have an official Opposition group consisting of 21 members, and the Liberal group consisting of 14. And the group of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) consisting of only two members.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, but think of the quality.

MR. MACLEOD: That is what it was in Saskatchewan where there were only two Progressive Conservatives. And

now there are none.

MR. FROST: That is true. We have these small Committee creating this problem; while we endeavour to give the other groups representation, I do not think it comes as a matter as right. The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) will see what the difficulty is. If we start with a group which is very small, we take one member out of two. That means, if we follow that through all Committees, either one of the two hon. members is represented on a Committee.

Then we consider the Liberal Group with 14 members, and they would say they were entitled to twice as many, and the C.C.F. Opposition is entitled to more members than any of the other Oppositions, of course. So, if you follow that out to its logical conclusion, you have a minimum of seven members from the Opposition, one from the group of my hon. friend (Mr. MacLeod), two from the Liberals, and four from the C.C.F. It is, I think, within reason that the government must have a majority on these Committees. That is the constitutional practice. It means that the minimun number of members on the Committee becomes too large. I point out to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) in this connection we can only do the best we can. I would point out to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) that if he wants to sit there in splendid isolation, with a couple of members, he has to take the disabilities which go with it. I pointed out that he might come in with the great Progressive Group, where he could give effect to his talents in a better way. That could be done. But he sees fit to sit with a small group, and without going into the merits, or otherwise, of the things he represents, if he desires to do that, he must accept the

disabilities that go with it.

MR. MACLEOD: Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) permit a question?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. MACLEOD: I find it difficult to understand why you did not see all these difficult obstacles when you set up the Committee on Members Indemnity. You did not have it worked out mathematically then. That is the first point. You did not work this thing out with such mathematical precision last year.

The other point I want to make is this; if I follow you, you were suggesting that you keep the Committee down to seven, and confine the representation to the two Opposition groups out of consideration for the Opposition groups. I take it, therefore, the official Opposition and the "Modern Liberal Democracy" insisted that they have representation proportionate to their members, therefore, there is a tripartite alliance against us.

MR. PORTER: We have to split the atom over there.

MR. FROST: I duscussed the matter with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) on a number of occasions, and I think he has been most generous in his view in connection with the Opposition, and has endeavoured to give to the Leaders of the Opposition, even the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) representation, to the extent of reducing his own representation from his own group. In a number of cases he has recommended but one member from the Official Opposition, to make room for representatives from the other Opposition groups in the House. I point out to the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) there are great difficulties

there, and I say again we can only do the best we can.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I say a word for what it may be worth on both questions.

First of all, with reference to the size of the Committee and the representation thereon; there is, of course, a certain mathematical ratio between the strength of the four groups in the House. It is, practically speaking, impossible to implement that ratio in the case of all Committees, unless the Committees are to be of a very unwieldy size. The result is this, I think, in the case of most Committees - not all -- that we have had a certain amount of give and take. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) may feel there has not been sufficient give and take recently in connection with the Committees recently appointed. I think if I were in his position I would probably feel the same way. But the fact is that all of us have had to make some substantial concessions in this regard.

Two years ago a Conservation Committee was appointed in which many of the Opposition groups were greatly interested. The original suggestion for that Committee came from the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), and I did not question -- and I do not question -- the propriety of giving the Liberal group on that Committee the same representation as the Official Opposition Group. They had two, and we had two; the government had five.

In the case of the Committee on Indemnity, the government did not have a majority. That was an exceptional case. We might as well be frank about it, I think the government felt, as the Opposition groups have felt, that there

was not much point in going into the matter unless all parties were represented, and there was not much point in having a government majority, or a majority of any other group, because the success of the Committee could not depend on any particular group having a majority. The result was three Conservative members appointed to that Committee, one from this group, one from the Liberal group, and one from the Progressive group.

There have been other Committees on which the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) has been represented either in his own distinguished person, or by his Whip, attorney General, and financial critic.

SOME hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There have been such cases were, mathematically speaking, there was no valid claim for representation, but representation was given, which I think was entirely proper. I will say to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that I think on the Committees on which I have sat with him he has made a distinguished contribution. Particularly, I remember the Committee on Election Law of seven years ago, on which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and myself both sat, and the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) was a most helpful and valuable member. That Committee also was one on which the Labor Progressive Group could not have claimed representation on a mathematical basis, but on which they were given representation.

Now, coming down to the appointment of the recent Committees; being a believer in Committee processes, I would have preferred that the membership of recent Committees had been enlarged. But I saw the practical difficulty.

This practical difficulty makes it necessary, in the view of the government to keep the size of the Committee within reasonable bounds, and to appoint, for example, seven, rather than nine or twelve, which some would have preferred. I disagree with the government about that. I am not prepared to make an issue of it, because there is a limit to the number of members which might be available to serve on these Committees. I would add that the appointment of members of this Committee, as between the Liberal and C.C.F. groups, is, by no means, exact. On the two Committees most recently appointed, there will be only one Liberal member. Strictly speaking, they are entitled to claim 1 1/4 or 1 1/3 members, or entitled to two members to our three, but the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has not pressed that claim, just as I did not press any claim for three members on the Conservation Committee, or some other where we expect equality or parity with the Liberal group.

I understand how the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) feels, and I would say to him it is not feasible for his group to be represented on all Committees, just as he had representation on some where he was not mathematically entitled to it, and it is rather to be expected that he will not have representation on others where no doubt he feels it would be well for his group to have at least one member.

May I address myself now to the other point, namely, that of the legality or constitutionality of the delegation of powers; I have not given that consideration, but broadly speaking, Mr. Speaker, I am an opponent of the restriction of the powers of the Legislature in any way, shape or form. This House persistently -- perhaps too often -- delegates

the powers of legislation to the Cabinet. Many of us think that tendency has been carried too far in this day and age. It probably has been carried too far, nevertheless, I do not see, without much consideration I must admit -- any valid objection, legally speaking to the delegation of power being stated, although I think perhaps it could be stated a little bit more clearly.

I want to make plain my own position in respect to the absence of a member appointed to a Committee. I do not agree that the absence or incapacity of a member of a Select Committee necessitates the failure of that Committee to function.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That seems to me a perfectly absurd position; to me I feel that a Commission should have no compunction about meeting, in the absence of a member, so long as there was a quorum available. I do not agree with the excuse advanced on several occasions that a certain Committee could not meet or function because one of its members was away. I will have more to say later in another connection about the way in which some of our Committees are functioning.

On the other hand, I think if a vacancy should occur on a Committee, there should be some machinery for filling that vacancy. I think that is desirable. I am not entirely clear about the procedure to be followed under this resolution.

The last paragraph reads:

> "In the event of a vacancy occurring in the membership of the Committee, the

vacancy shll be filled by the appointment of a member on the recommendation of the leader of the party to which the former member belonged"

Appointed by whom? I suppose possibly, the appointment by the Committee itself. I think perhaps the body to which this power should be delegated is the Committee itself, and I would expect that the Committee would accept the recommendation of the Leader of the party concerned. I am wondering who is the Leader of what party concerned. From a parliamentary point of view, I think it is the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver).

MR. FROST: We only recognize him.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you very much.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think he deserves recognition.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think after 25 years in this House, we would not go very far wrong by accepting his recommendation, in view of the sitinguished leadership he has given in this House under very difficult circumstances, and without much public support.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

C-1

MR. MacLEOD: This is the beginning of a "start Oliver" movement.

MR. FROST: I prophesy that the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) will be the next leader of the Liberal party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not wish to start any political revolution. I was making a strictly legal argument here about the power of the Legislature to delegate a certain power. It may be unprecedented, and in some cases it might, perhaps, be unwise, but on the whole, I think it is desirable that if vacancies appear, they should be filled. I would, therefore, favour the substance of the resolution.

MR. PORTER: I wish to say a very few words. I would like to assure the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) that it is not intended in any way to put a restriction upon either of the hon. members, or upon the sort of contribution we could expect from them. I might remind the hon. members that on many important Committees, on the not just minor Committees, of this House, but important Committees, the two hon. members (Mr. MacLeod and Mr. Salsberg) for the Labour-Progressive Party, have been fully recognized, and I wish to acknowledge, as far as I am concerned, the very great contribution which has been made by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) in the

Committee work of this House. I think that in all fairness, many other hon. members of this House, many of whom could also make very valuable contributions to Committees, and who are not on this Committee, and who may have a great deal of personal knowledge of the problems involved in this House, because there are many other hon. members of this House who represent the urban areas and areas where rent control is a very important matter, we would have great profit, I think, in this Committee, if we could have some of those hon. members also on the Committee. But, a Committee which meets in between Sessions, should not be too unwieldy, because it means the hon. members have to come some distance to attend meetings, and in order to carry on the work of the Committee expeditiously, it should be kept, I think, within reasonable bounds. I would say this about the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), I think they have been very well and fully recognized on the important Committees of this House not only during this Session, but prior to this Session throughout the whole of the time this Government has been in power. It is not because we do not think the hon. members would not make a valuable contribution to this Committee; it is not that, because the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) have made valuable contributions to other Committees, but because, as the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has stated, we have to recognize as far as

possible the different hon. members of this House, and in so doing we have done it in this way. It has been suggested that one solution might be, in view of the great mathematical and algebraic problems, which have been posed with reference to this matter, if the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) were to be on the Committee, he should be allowed to attend only every third meeting. That may be one way of solving it.

MR. MacLEOD: That makes the Hon. Attorney) General (Mr. Porter) every other inch a gentleman.

Motion agreed to.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): I wonder if the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) would take care of the situation on the Government side of the House. I am afraid it might be rather disastrous to the hon. member.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it would only take a few moments to clarify the milk situation, and I would move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee of the Whole. (Mr. T. L. Patrick in the Chair.)

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order

No.17.

THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1951

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 17th Order, House in Committee on Section 7 of Bill No. 157, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1951. Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Chairman, I am proposing a further amendment to this Bill which I will designate as Section 7(a).

I move that this Bill be amended by adding thereto the following section:

"7(a) -- (1) Section 7 of the Milk Control Amendment Act, 1951, is amended by adding thereto the following sub-section:

(4) In this section the words 'milk' and 'market' have the same meanings as in The Milk Control Act.

(2) This Section shall be deemed to come into force on the 21st day of March, 1951."

The difficulty which has arisen is, I think, perhaps something which has arisen unnecessarily and might have resulted from misinterpretation. I think The Milk Control Act, itself, and the amendment, really should have covered the situation, but, on the other hand, if there is any doubt about it, we wish to make sure that there will not be that doubt. The difficulty, apparently, arose as the result of Section 9 of Section 7 of The Milk Control Amendment Act, which

reads as follows:

> "7 (1) Any increase in the price at which milk is sold by retail in a market on or after the 15th day of March, 1951, and before a maximum price applicable in that market has been prescribed under The Milk Control Act, is void and of no effect."

If the hon. member will glance over The Milk Control Act, it will be seen that all other sections appear to the amendments to The Milk Control Act and are so stated to be in each of those sections; but Section 7 is not so stated and that is for the simple reason that it provides for something which will have effect after the 15th March, 1951, which is a date much later than the original act., So, that is a new substituting section which, in a sense, is not an amendment to The Milk Control Act; therefore it has been suggested that the definition of "milk" in the Milk Control Act does not apply to Section 7 of this Bill, and that for that reason the products of milk and any substances which might result from the processing of milk and which are covered broadly in the original definition of The Milk Control Act, that that would not apply there, and it left the word "milk" in the ordinary sense, whatever it may mean. Therefore, the amendment I propose is for the purpose of making applicable to this Section 7 the original definition. I think that explains the matter.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): I may say that in my view, for whatever it may be worth, the argument which the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) mentions, namely, the argument of the definition of "milk" or "market" in The Milk Control Act did not apply to Section 7 is a specious argument. It is just as well to remove any doubt about it, and settle the matter here, rather than get it settled in the courts.

There is one question I would like to raise. I see the Hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is not in the House, but maybe we can get the information from another source. The problem involved revolves around the word "market" as well as the word "milk". A market is defined in The Milk Control Act, Section 1-h:

> "Market means the market named in an agreement or award, or the market supplied with milk by the producers represented by a marketing agency or by an association."

I take it that that would cover the Toronto market, for example, in which there is an award in effect, an agreement or award in effect, and in which the producers are represented by The Toronto Milk Producers Association, that is, are represented by a producers' organization. This thought, however, occurs to me. We may as well be prepared to meet these quibbles. As I recall the award or the agreement for the Toronto area, it relates to the

price to the producer of whole milk, the primary price and the secondary price. Is it possible it will be argued that that definition of a market does not include the market for the purpose of associated products, which become other products after processing, a product such as skim milk, cream and so on. I would like to have the view of the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) on that. I am not saying it is a valid quibble, but I can foresee the possibility it may be raised. The point is that milk is supplied by the producer to the Toronto Distributors under an agreement or an award which fixes the primary price and the secondary price. After that transfer of whole milk to them, the distributors undertake certain processing as the result of which they offer at retail associated products which undoubtedly come within the definition of the word "milk". Can it be argued on their behalf that such products are, thereby, excluded from the definition within the Act?

MR. PORTER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has raised a point which, no doubt, he would agree to describe as a fine point. Of course, the fine point sometimes becomes very serious and a matter which should be considered.

By the amendment I have proposed, of course, not only the word "milk", but the word "market" is read back into the Act. There is no doubt about that, as I understand it, and the

Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will correct me if I am wrong, because I am not thoroughly familiar with all this agricultural machinery and the rural way of life, and I have to do my best to understand some of the goings-on, and I suppose it is all right--"market" means the market named in an agreement or an award, or the market supplied with milk by the producers represented by a marketingagency or by an association. That definition of "market" is taken in by the proposed amendment and has become applicable to Section 7 of The Milk Control Amendment Act, and, where it says that any increase in price at which milk is sold by retail in a market, surely the word "market" would, by the definition in the Milk Control Act, be the area which would be the market following that definition, whether or not the sort of products which might be involved are contemplated in the agreement, or otherwise. I would think that would be clear enough. Whether or not I have the whole import of the point of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) I am not sure.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not wish to prolong this matter, but let me just for a moment act as devil's advocate and put the point to the Attorney-General in another way; let us assume that there is an agreement between producers and distributors in the Toronto market and that the agreement refers to price for whole milk sold by the producers to the distributors --

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: --- it is therefore, a market within the meaning of the Act with respect to whole milk.

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The distributors, having purchased the milk, process and sell at retail an associated product, say, skim milk, they bought no skim milk from the producers, and it is, therefore, not mentioned in their agreement with the producer. It is outside the scope of their agreement with the producer. The Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) or the Milk Control Board tells me as a producer that "you cannot increase the price of skim milk because you have not been to the Board to obtain authority for such an increase." And my reply is, "I am selling skim milk, which is milk within the meaning of 'milk' as defined in the Act, but I am selling it in a market which is not a market within the meaning of 'market' as defined in Section 1-h of the Act." It is not a market, because the only agreement in effect has no relation whatever to skim milk. I am selling something retail which is entirely outside the field of the agreement of the producers with the distributors.

I am not saying I believe in this argument, but I am just anticipating a case with which the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) may be confronted. I am sorry I did not think of this yesterday. If I had, I would have told the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter)

about it. Actually, it did not occur to me until this morning. With my rural background, of course, I woke up at five o'clock in the morning and immediately thought about it.

MR. PORTER: I agree with the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). He has raised a point which might come up for consideration at some time, but I think it would be a pretty fine point. I do not know whether it is really necessary to consider any further amendment at this stage.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Probably not. I just thought if I had thought of it, the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) would have, too.

MR. PORTER: Now that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has stated his point, it will give a lot of people ideas.

We have appointed Mr. W. C. Alcombrack, who has had a great deal of work in the drafting of Statutes, and is thoroughly familiar with this Act and similar Acts. We have appointed Mr. Alcombrack as counsel to the Milk Control Board. He will attend all meetings of the Milk Control Board, and if points of law arise of this kind, or any other kind, he will be there to argue fully the various aspects of the particular point involved, so that there will be a very minimum danger of not at least having the fullest argument in favour of the effectiveness of the Act.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Yesterday, when I raised this matter, I was concerned particularly, from

the standpoint of the housewives of this city, who were given to understand that only whole milk would go up half a cent and who were rather surprised when the price of skim milk increased from 14½ to 15 cents, cream from 35 to 40 cents and 18% per cent cream from 20 to 22 cents. Is it the opinion of the Hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) that the award made on that one day in this area, if we pass this, will continue those increases in the skim milk field, and the cereal cream field?

MR. PORTER: I think that under this amendment the Board will have full power to reconsider. The Board is not bound by any decision made; they can always reconsider a decision. I hope the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) will use his influence with the housewives of this city to make them understand that everything is being done in their interests, which can possibly be done.

Section 7-a agreed to.

Section 7 agreed to.

Bill No. 157 reported.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I move the Committee rise and report a certain bill with amendment.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): On a point of order, might I ask the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) if he can inform me what bill was passed in this Legislature empowering the Board of Education in Toronto to hire a psychiatrist?

MR. PORTER: The Statute Law Amendment Act. The Hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) voted for it.

MR. TEMPLE: I did the right thing, then.

MR. PORTER: I hope the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) approved.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): I move the Committee rise and report certain bills.

Motion agreed to.

House resumes; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, The Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain bills with amendment, begs leave to sit again and moved the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.16.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 16th Order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply. Mr. Frost.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on the Budget Debate, I want to say to the House at once that I am going to refrain from making a long speech on this occasion because I know it is the understanding of most of the

hon. members of the House that we conclude our business this afternoon in time to prorogue the Legislature. I do not wish to interfere with that procedure.

I want to say in regard to the Debate which is now drawing to a close, there have been two or three things which have stood out, in my mind at least, as being characteristic of the debate as a whole. In the first place, I think the hon. members of the House generally will concede that the speeches made in the present Budget Debate have been at least above average; they have been well-prepared, well-delivered, and were a definite contribution, not only to the financial affairs of the province, but to the general economic condition of the province. I think I should say, also, that, aside from any partisan considerations that may be concerned, the House , as a whole, I feel, believes that the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has carried a very heavy load throughout this Session, and in the main, has carried it exceptionally well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. OLIVER: They say it is better to say good things about a man while he is living, than to say them after he is gone. In this case, it would be politically gone. I want to take, perhaps, the last opportunity of saying that to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). There are some dangers which are inherent of the exalted position the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) now occupies. One of them is, and it has become very evident during this Session of the House, that the Hon. Prime Minister

(Mr. Frost) is taking too much responsibility on his own shoulders. We had in this province a few years ago a man who did everything himself, and unfortunately he did it all badly. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should benefit from the experience of the past. It is an excellent thing for a Prime Minister to be able to divide ministerial responsibilities and to allow those Ministers -- yea, to expect that those Ministers accept that responsibility. There has been a tendency in this Legislature, I feel, to depart from that very basic principle. The sooner we get back to it, the better for all concerned.

The other feature of the Hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) conduct during the Session about which I just want to say a word, is that at odd times -- and thank goodness they were very odd -- the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) lost his temper. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is far from his best when he loses his temper. Last night was an example. I am sure the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) regrets on reflection this morning. The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder), far from being a coward, or doing a cowardly thing, in my judgment, did a courageous thing. I mean, it takes courage to say the things said by the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder).

MR. PORTER: He did not say anything.

MR. OLIVER: Having regard to what the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said, in my opinion it does not raise the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in the estimation of

the hon. members of the House, or in the estimation of the public generally. I think the sooner we get back to relative sanity in regard to our treatment of one another and what we say about one another in this House, the more progress we will make in the best interests of the province, as a whole.

Coming to the Budget -- it has been on the books for so long now, it is difficult just to recall what its salient features were -- I understand, if my memory serves me correctly, that the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was able to balance the budget and to show a considerable surplus in ordinary revenue over ordinary expenditure. That is not an achievement in these days. It would be an achievement, rather, if the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) were able to show a deficit in the ordinary financing of the province. So, we need not dwell very long on that. In fact, I do not want to talk about what was in the Budget, but rather, what it failed to contain. I want to confine myself to two or three subjects in this regard and to do it in the briefest possible time.

In the first place, and I say this seriously to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and to the hon. members of the Government, that I believe their position as a Government is indefensible in regard to the Old Age Pension question. I believe it is indefensible. That is my opinion. It is shared, I think, by many others, but I am speaking for myself now when I say that the position of the Government

before the bar of public opinion in this province cannot be defended to the satisfaction of the people generally.

The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), when speaking, I believe, in the Budget Debate or on some other occasion in the House, said to the House that he believed there was more than an even chance we would be able to come to an agreement with the Federal Government relative to an all-over pension scheme by the first of January, 1952. All parties in the House share his hope that this will be a realization and an accomplishment. We know the inherent difficulties which lie in the path of an achievement of that kind. In these days when we are torn by war and rumours of war, it is difficult to assess properly and adequately what might or might not transpire in the year which lies ahead; but all of us, I say, go along with the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in the hope and in the expectation that by January, 1952, we will have an over-all pension scheme in respect of which this Government can place itself as a contributing factor. The point I want to make is, that in the interval which lies between now and January first, 1952, it is a solemn obligation of this Government to take up the slack, to stand on guard for our old people. The Government should do that in the interval, that is, between now and the time we all expect there will be an agreement between the province and the Dominion on an over-all pension scheme.

(Take D follows.)

I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that it is unreasonable to expect the Dominion government -- if there is going to be an agreement -- to change their pension machinery to take effect between now and the 1st of January, 1952. It is the obligation -- and I would say the sole obligation -- of this province to fill the gap between now and the 1st of January, 1952. I have always thought during my political carreer that the badge of good government was the government's attitude toward social legislation. A government can do as it likes with regard to carrying on the policies of any of the departments of government, but if they fail or fall short of the maximum toward the people who need the help most in the province which they govern, they have not governed well. So I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) this afternoon, that he has an obligation, as head of the government, to do something for old-age pensioners in the interval between now and January 1st, 1952. I do not think this House would criticize the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) were he to issue warrants or Treasury Minutes, or whatever he might have to do in order to finance this humane operation, an operation which would serve all, and the expectancy of an even "break" in the lives of thousands upon thousands of people in this province. How they get along on $40. a month, I do not know. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree it is an impossible situation from a financial point of view. I stress that, because I feel that is one of the paramount things which has been left undone by this Legislature, and ignored by the present administration,

and it will be held responsible before the bar of public opinion for this omission.

Then there is the question of the incapacitated persons. I do not want to argue that at length, but I do want to say with regard to that class of people that the time has long since passed in this province when by means of a pension of some kind, care should be taken of those people who, through no fault of their own, are unable to take care of themselves, through sickness, through disease, through inability to work, whatever it may be; they cannot take care of themselves --

MR. FROST: I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) if he is speaking about handicapped persons, I made that proposal at Ottawa, and I advanced it very elaborately, but I could get no agreement from the other provinces or the Federal government in that regard.

I explained to this House that I do not like, altogether the 65-69 arrangement, but I was prepared to accept that, if we could reach agreement on that point, and I felt we were making substantial progress, I said it then, and I feel that way about it now.

MR. OLIVER: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has claimed many times throughout this Session that the government has been the first in many things --

MR. FROST: That is substantially right.

MR. OLIVER: I am not prepared to argue the authenticity or the correctness of that statement, but the claim has been made that the government has been the first in this, that, and the other thing, and I suggest they could still

have another "first". There is no reason why the province could not set up at the present time a scheme which would help that particular class of people, and when the agreement was endorsed by the Federal Government, it could be worked in, without any further delay.

MR. FROST: That is true, except for the compression of our taxing powers by very heavy Federal taxation. If we had the unrestricted use of that field, I would think that suggestion a very good one.

MR. OLIVER: You could not do anything which would pay a greater dividend to the people of this province.

I want to say this to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- and I say it seriously -- that after the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) came home from the Dominion-Provincial Conference, there was a feeling throughout the province, when he spoke of old-age pensions and social welfare matters, that he, as head of the government, had done about all that he could; that he had made a good contribution in Ottawa. But that feeling is changed now very definitely throughout this province, and the feeling which is crystalizing now is that this government, with its tremendous surpluses, and its ability to collect taxes in this province, should do something themselves, and it was within their jurisdiction financially to meet this problem head on for a definite, stated interval between now and the time the Federal-Provincial agreement was consummated.

MR. FROST: I point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that while I recognize the merit in what he says, and the attitude in which it is advanced, our position is so vulnerable

that if, for instance, in the coming Budget, the Federal Government made a change in the Liquor Tax, it might put us into a deficit of $10,000,000. We are in a strong position, but only in a strong position as long as our position is not interfered with by the Federal Government imposing very heavy taxation, for instance, on liquor, which would affect our revenue, and might put us into a deficit position of at least $10,000,000.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): You would rather leave the handicapped people in a weak position, than have the financial position of the province a little weaker?

MR. FROST: I will take that up this afternoon.

MR. OLIVER: I want to retain the continuity of my argument. I am not advancing it to hurt myself politically, and I am not trying to make a political argument, if you know what I mean. We feel very keenly the humanitarianism of this particular problem, and we feel this government has not lived up to its obligations, nor the expectations of the people of this province which are within its jurisdiction, As the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) well knows, their obligation is toward passing a supplemental amount to assist the old-age pensioners, and our handicapped people.

This government, in my opinion, has no excuse whatever for continuing its present position in regard to these very important matters.

I want to touch for a moment on the question of agricultural conditions in the province, and do so rather briefly. I think it is understood by all the hon. members of this Legislature that the agricultural industry of the province of Ontario is still a very important industry.

I believe in the days which are coming -- perhaps the next months which are coming -- will emphasize the importance of that industry beyond its present realization.

Agriculture, as everyone knows, had lost much of its man power during the last couple of decades to industrial areas, and it has become increasingly important that the agricultural industry become more efficient in operation, and that they place their plants in a position to produce agricultural products in an ever-increasing quantity.

We know that many more people are living in our urban centres, and fewer people living on the farms, so that the basic difficulty in agriculture is increasing as the years go by. Our attitude is that the government should lend every assistance it can to the basic industry of agriculture, in order that it may adequately and fully discharge its obligations in that respect. There is need in this province today for the government to take a realistic approach to the problems not just the casual approach we have had for the last number of years, but one that realizes the inherent dangers of our present floating position in regard to agriculture. There is need to approach the problem of agriculture from a completely new angle -- a new approach entirely different from that which has been used over the last number of years, and the Conservation Committee set out that approach in a very fine Report to this House.

Unfortunately -- and I say that deliberately -- for the people of this province, that Report has not been acted upon to any great degree. There are some very important and fundamental things in that Report which the government has failed to take action upon; in fact, it

has just nibbled at them, and the nibbles have been feeble ones. There were some recommendations, which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will recall; one, that there would be a great increase in research and specialized programs in this province of Ontario, that there should be a closer liaison between the Agricultural College at Guelph, and the farmers; so that the farmers could feel that at all times they had the entree to that College and that we would now have a good record of research and apply the research on farming in the province. Little has been done about that. There is a terrific lag between them. You need to increase the staff at the Agricultural College; you need to increase the money which is being spent on research, before you will do a job in that regard. But there was never a time -- and I stress this to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- when you needed to pay more attention to the soil of the province of Ontario than you are doing right now, because it will be called upon in the years which lie ahead to do more and more, and you draw something away from the soil, you leave less in the soil, and we must devise a formula, with a realistic approach, so that this question will be taken up and dealt with almost immediately.

I want to say to the House that, in my opinion, the danger in this province in the years to come, is not one of over-production on our farms, but one of under-production. They will be called upon in the years to come for increasing quantities of agricultural products, and we should be prepared to meet that challenge, which comes

to the province and to the government of the province.

Of course, when you were speaking about the farms and the tax structure now imposed on the farmers, as well as the urban people, that is a situation which needs revision, and needs it very badly. I would say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) there is danger of the farmers being driven off their farms by high taxes at the present time. The main item is the school tax of this province, which now comes to more than one-quarter of the farmers' taxes.

It is all very well to say we have a very enlightened school curriculum, and we have a school system which is much better than our fathers had, but I think it wise sometimes to stop and think how much we can afford to pay for even good things. There is a line of demarcation beyond which it is not safe to go in pressing expenditures upon our farm people, and city dwellers as well. Our hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy), a man who knows the pulse of the farm people of this province -- or did know it, said in the city of Toronto not very long precisely what I said this afternoon, and I want to quote what Mr. Kennedy said on that occasion, at the Good Roads Convention, during this past winter:

> "Many farmers are leaving the farms due to high taxes, and I do not blame them. Too much of an educational tax which now is 50% of the total tax, and will soon be 75%, is bad for the farmers of the province of Ontario."

I do not want to criticize our educational system, but I do want to draw to the attention of the government the fact that there is unrest growing in the ranks of the tax payers of this province against the terrific increase of taxation, particularly school taxation, but we should approach the fact in a realistic fashion, and I say again to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that not only in regard to the farmers' taxes for education, but the whole system of taxation is burdensome to the province, and it has to be reviewed in the light of present day conditions, and to put it off any longer will create a worse situation than we have at the present time. You only need to read what has happened in the city of Toronto, where $25,000,000 additional taxes in the last five years show a terrific increase.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) knows that most of that came from the fact that the cost of living index now is about 179½.

MR. OLIVER: You are not right on that. I have an editorial from The Telegram here somewhere, and $9,000,000 from that $25,000,000 increase is to pay for education.

MR. FROST: I point out to the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) --

MR. OLIVER: I point that out to you.

MR. FROST: -- that because of the increased cost of everything, building cost --.

MR. OLIVER: Irrespective of that, this province has an obligation it can no longer shirk, and that obligation is to get these municipalities together to work with them and re-align the responsibility, insofar as taxation is concerned.

Municipalities generally are just about at the end of

their rope, so far as taxation is concerned. They are in a hopeless position, so far as increasing the basis of their revenue is concerned. They just cannot do it. It is a static condition, so far as the revenue-producing units are concerned, and they are caught between two very bad fires, and the only one who can put the fire out is the provincial government, which has an obligation it will have to discharge. I say that definitely to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) this afternoon.

I want to come back for a moment or two to the Conservation Report. I want to say two or three things about it, to which I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree.

In the first place, the conservation problem in this province is a big question which affects not only the farmers, but people in all walks of life. It has a broad application throughout the province. There are two or three fundamental things this government is just going to have to do -- and it may be another of the "firsts" about which they speak --

I hope there will be more meat in it than some of the others, but here are two or three things which have to be done. Conservation, at the moment, is under the Department of Planning and Development. In order to get the picture, you have to go through half a dozen departments of government, and by the time it gets to the end of the line, the project is pretty well washed out, and that is not to be wondered at. The Department of Planning and Development is, after all, a junior department of government, and in this matter it is dealing with the old, established departments of government, which have prior rights by tradition, and you have to go

through these departments in order to get any action, and if it goes through each department it loses its strength and its colour, and when it gets to the line, it is a very anemic piece of legislation. You just would not know it at all.

If you are serious about the matter of conservation in this province, you have to establish a single authority, an authority which shall have the right to say "This shall be done", or "This shall not be done". That was one of the basic recommendations of the Committee's Report, and that has to be done before we can expect any real leadership in respect to conservation.

The other matter I want to touch upon is this; it has to do with the question of wherein does this government's responsibility lie for conservation? The government has been very good -- or bad -- whicever term you think is proper to use -- at saying "We cannot go ahead with this or that, because we have not been assured of Dominion participation".

I want to make it abundantly clear to this House that, in my opinion, there are certainthings which should be done solely by the province, and in which we should not expect Dominion participation. We should not expect Dominion participation in regard to applied science on the farms in regard to soil conservation, and all that stuff. That should be done by the province itself.

They should not expect the Dominion participation, so far as small dams, small creeks and rivers are concerned. That is not a matter of Dominion jurisdiction. It is a matter of provincial responsibility they have not been willing to

accept. I do not think you can any longer go on saying "We cannot do this, because of lack of Dominion participation". There is a line of demarcation, and beyond that line it is the responsibility of the Dominion government to step in, in regard to any project, but below that line, all these hundred and one things are the responsibility of the province,and should be dealt with by the province, without asking the Dominion to participate in any way.

I want to say, as I conclude, Mr. Speaker, that I was interested this morning in the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), as I am always interested in his remarks, when he said we were doing a job here and doing it rather well without much public support. Those were the words which "burned me up" -- "without much public support". I want to discuss that for a moment, with the House.

It may be a family affair, but we can discuss it for a moment. I would agree that our role in the Legislature this year has been necessarily difficult. I think that has been generally accepted. I think the role such as we have had to play is difficult no matter what particular Legislature it is in. We have tried to discharge our responsibilities in a way we feel was strengthening to our Leader outside, and also to give expression to our convictions in the Legislature itself. I do not agree for a moment with my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that part of our trouble has been caused by lack of public support. After all, I only want to remind him that we received at the last election more public support than he did, --

MR. JOLLIFFE: But we got in.

MR. OLIVER: Yes, but since then, there is a school of public opinion known as the Gallup Poll, which has made two or three surveys, and the last one suggest we have not lost any public support, but we have gained very definitely.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Perhaps I was wrong, but I assumed that with the change in the status of my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) there would be a loss of public support. I still think I am right.

MR. OLIVER: My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) and I will have it out with the Gallup Poll.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman, I am sure --

MR. OLIVER: Oh, let me finish speaking.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) has the floor.

MR. OLIVER: I want to say to the House, as I sit down, that we knew when we came into the House with a Leader selected by our Convention who was not a member of the House, that there would be inherent difficulties. That was to be expected. We knew there would be from time to time an attempt to misrepresent to some extent what our Leader was saying outside. I do not believe for one moment that he ever said that the villages of Ontario were using more power than the cities of Montreal and Toronto. That is so blatantly wrong, that no one should believe it for a moment.

MR. Challies: The hon. member for Prince-Edward-Lennox (Mr. Baxter) was at the meeting where he made that statement, and he should remember. I have the quotation from the Star of November 23rd, 1950.

MR. OLIVER: I do not even accept that. I mean seriously that I do not accept that my leader outside did say that for a moment. My hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Challies) the other day quoted what purported to be a statement from Mr. Thomson. I asked him to send the article over, and it was not a direct quotation from the remarks of Mr. Thomson at all; written some days after Mr. Thomson had spoken.

MR. Challies: It is a quotation from the Star's report of a meeting at Sydenham, at which the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Baxter)was present.

MR. OLIVER: Sometimes even newspapers make mistakes. I think the Star has been pretty accurate lately.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. GEORGE DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): It is about time.

MR. OLIVER: I want to leave, Mr. Speaker, with the assurance that we have played our role in the House to the best of our ability, and have done what we thought was in the public interest. The next role will be played in a larger forum and a larger arena, and we will endeavour to carry out these arguments in that forum and arena with a great deal of effectiveness. I say that to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in sitting down.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

MR. A. W. DOWNER (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I realize it is quite late in the Session for a long speech, and I do not wish to delay this session unduly, and to hurry things along perhaps it would be as well if I kept very close to my prepared text. If I were to speak extemporaneously, it would be much longer; if I keep to my prepared text, I can be through in a few minutes.

MR. MacLEOD: Which would you rather do.

MR. DOWNER: There are a few things I would like to say; a few observations I would like to make.

The first duty of any government, whether it be Provincial, Federal or Municipal is to look after and plan for the peace, prosperity, security and happiness of its people. This the present Government is doing, and I believe every Member, even those in the Opposition parties, will agree with that statement.

Far-reaching legislation concerning the welfare of our people has been presented and passed almost unanimously, proving beyond a shadow of doubt that everyone in this House believes in what the Government is trying to do. The general principles of the main bills have been acceptable to all groups, and that is a healthy sign and a sure sign that the Government is moving in the right direction.

The Government has proved to be a benevolent one over the past eight years, since almost 35% of our revenues have been passed on to the municipalities to help them keep down the municipal tax rates. I was

amazed to read yesterday that a controller in the City of Toronto made a statement in which he said that the Provincial government was responsible for the high tax rate in the City of Toronto, I am sure he was speaking just to hear himself, because if it weren't for the grants to Education, to Police, to Firemen and Hispitals, the tax rate in the City of Toronto

(Page E-3 follows.)

would be at least 10 mills higher as it would be in almost every other municipality in Ontario.

The tax rate in the City of Toronto is not any higher than elsewhere, but it would be a great deal higher if it were not for the grants to municipal services.

As for the assessment in the city, it is not much higher than in smaller municipalities. If the City of Toronto wants to lower its tax rate, let them cut down on unnecessary expenses. What municipality, for example, provides private cars with chauffeur for its council members? Surely that great and important part of Toronto lying outside the City of Toronto should not be asked to contribute more to the city than it already has. Toronto is the centre of our Province, and as such, milks the rest of the province in so many ways, through its mailorder houses, head offices of banks and insurance companies, etc. It is also the centre of education in that the University of Toronto is located here. All these things help the city and contribute to its taxes.

However, I would like to see the Government give some further thought to assisting the municipalities in meeting the increased costs of operating Children's Aid Societies in this Province. This cost has increased tremendously over the last few years. In the County of Simcoe, it was only $16,000. a few years ago, and to-day it is over $100,000. and the municipalities are finding it increasingly difficult to carry this burden.

I note that the cost is larger, due to the number of children coming from broken homes, and I would like to congratulate the counties in setting up family courts, as I know these courts have mended many a broken home and taken the children off the Childrens' Aid rolls. I would suggest that we go deeper and do something in our schools to educate our children about marriage and the responsibilities that belong to parents. In this way, we might in the long run overcome a very serious situation in our Province.

I would like to congratulate and commend the Honourable Minister of Education on the forward-looking policy of his Department. Education has advanced by leaps and bounds over the past eight years and now almost every boy and girl in the province has an equal chance of getting an education, no matter where he or she may live.

Suring the past five years over 900 new primary and secondary schools have been built, and not only that, but the curriculum has been modified and brought up to date instead of lagging behind as it did for so many years. As far as education is concerned, Ontario now stands in the forefront as far as educational facilities are concerned. What a program! As you drive about this great Province, you cannot but be proud of the school buildings and the type of education provided. Our young people are now equipped in our schools to face life, mentally, morally, and physically, and above all,

they now go out from our schools equipped to earn a living. I regret exceedingly that in view of the important recommendations of the Hope Commission on Education that that report was not given more consideration by this House.

I know all of us, Mr. Speaker, are vitally interested in the rising cost of living. I am sure we know the reason for this increasing cost, and I want to say that this inflation is a grave danger indeed, and the real pressure is just getting well underway. I think that it can be said without exaggeration that within the next year or year-and-a-half at least 10% of the present working force will have been diverted from the production of consumer goods. That means more money in the hands of the people, fewer goods on the shelves, and since production cannot increase under those circumstances, inflation will continue as a major threat and a major problem.

Really, I don't know how our old age pensioners can properly live on the sum they are receiving. Imagine an old age pensioner having to rent a house and get a little meat at 80 cents a pound, on $40.00 a month! I do not see how these people exist, and it is not only those on pensions who are in the low income group. There are thousands of others in the Civil Service, in the farms, old people living on annuities in the same group, and they are finding it difficult to make ends meet during this period of high prices. The curtailment of instalment buying, the increase in the cost of borrowing

money, higher taxation - all these things afford some protection, but not enough.

I do not believe in controls just for the sake of controls, but when it is necessary to have controls - and in my opinion it is necessary now if we are to continue our way of life - there should be an immediate imposition of price and wage controls and then a proper adjustment made of both. I do not think that any fair-minded person would say that we could have an overall system of price control without wage control. I do not think that Labour itself would expect that. All of us realize that wages form a substantial part of the cost, and must enter into prices. I know we can do little here, but at any rate we can do something, even if it is only to prod Ottawa along.

During this debate, and also during the preceding debate, I have not heard any Member of this House mention the magnificant effort of United Nations Forces in Korea, or the heroic action of our own men, the Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry. They deserve our gratitude, for they along with those from other United Nations have in my humble opinion, prevented a full-fledged world war. I believe that they have given us time -- precious time -- in which to prepare, and our only hope for peace is in being well prepared for war. We did hear some words in condemnation of what has been done by the United Nations in Korea, but I say to this House, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations did the only thing possible to prevent war on a world wide scale. In sending our men to Korea we

simply fulfilled our obligations under the United Nations Charter. We shall do the same under the North Atlantic Treaty. The North Atlantic Treaty is primarily to defend us against Communism at large. But what about Communism at home? The Enemy is in our very midst. I believe that methods should be taken to suppress the Communist Party, action should be taken to destroy this organization which is dedicated to the forcible overthrow of the Government and to deprive us of our liberties and our way of life. I would not say too much over there -- a man who is the seventh ranking member of the Communist Party ---

MR. SALSBERG: Why not? I am ready to discuss it with you anywhere, any time.

MR. [illegible]NISON: We will vote them out in the next election.

MR. DOWNER: Communists, and especially those who enter our country from foreign lands, should be thrown out, bag and baggage. It is my conviction, too, that if we want to keep our freedom we must preserve our faith from which it arose. Christianity is the Mother of freedom. Faith alone gives men courage to throw off slavery, and faith alone gives them the self-control to use freedom right. Freedom is to-day threatened by tyranny as it has not been threatened since men first acquired it. We are in the folly stage already. Shall the fetters come next? The fetters have come for millions in the past decade, and they would come for us if we lose our faith . They have come for the millions in the

past decade, and they could come for us. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of our world a great nation has gone to war to implement its obligations under a collective agreement to outlaw and punish aggression wherever it takes place, and I am sure we rejoice that the United States has sent her sons to fight a difficult war, and I am sure we deplore the accusations made in the House that the U.S. intervention in Korea was based on Imperialism. These remarks were misleading, and in accusing the Americans of being Imperialists they are simply using the Communist-inspired line which comes from Moscow. Canada is taking part in this action, and we are proud to be linked with the other free nations of the world in suppressing aggression.

Now, just a few words about things here.

I would like to command the Minister and the Department of Planning and Development. We do not hear very much about that hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) He gave a very excellent report in the House not so very long ago, but we hear very little about the excellent work of that important department. I know something of the great work the Department is doing for the province of Ontario. Through the efforts of the Hon. Minister, and through his Department many firms have located in Ontario and hundreds of men and women have been employed. Many of these plants and hundreds of these people would not be here if it were not for the Minister of Planning and Development.

Criticism has often been offered over the immigration of so many from overseas, but we say, Mr. Speaker, that the Department has done a magnificent job for us in Ontario, not only in bringing in groups of selected immigrants, but also in the fact that these men represent a valuable section of our population in that every one brought in is at least the equivalent of $5,000 in technical training, in education. In other words, Ontario is at least 50 million dollars richer because they came. Almost every constituency has benefited from the efforts of the Minister of Planning and Development. No longer shall our municipalities grow up like Topsy, but each will be developed on solid plans provided for in a program of expansion. The Department and the Minister have always been ready to assist the municipalities, and I am grateful to the Minister for his help on many occasions in my area.

The Minister of Highways has done a fine job for the Province of Ontario. Our highways are improving year by year and compare favourably with highways anywhere in the world. And the Hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) -- well, I think our Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) knows this province as no other Minister of Highways has ever known it. He is the only Minister of Highways who has actually contacted the counties, and visited the municipalities, to find out first-hand what their needs and requirements are. Not only has he visited the counties,

and municipalities; not only does he know their needs and the requirements of the municipalities, but he has made provision to meet the needs and requirements of the municipalities, and greater assistance has been given to county roads and bridges by this Government than by any previous administration.

MR. BROWN: Not in Waterloo County.

MR. DOWNER: Naturally, each one of us is interested in his own area and I would like to ask that definite consideration be given to some roads in my constituency, Dufferin-Simcoe. Consideration should be given to roads where there is very heavy traffic and to roads that connect villages and towns to the main arteries of travel in the province. In my constituency, for example, there is the village of Creemore, a very lovely little village of 800 people. This village is cut off for several weeks during the early Spring because of the condition of the roads. The county road that serves this community is in bad condition, and I would like to see this road leading from Highway 90 at Angus to Maple Valley on Highway 24

(Page E-11 follows)

added to the Provincial highway system. This road is not only heavily travelled, but it takes a terrific beating because of the number of military vehicles, trucks, tanks using it.

I hope the Minister will consider this very seriously and put it on the priority list.

There are also two other villages in my constituency that should be considered, and they are Beeton and Tottenham. Both of these villages are about equal in population, and they are deserving of our consideration and should be linked by provincial highway to the main highways, No. 27 and No. 9.

I would like to express my appreciation to the Minister for the great improvement made on highways 24, 26, 89 and 27, and I trust that the good work thus started will go on until these roads are completely constructed. I have every confidence in the government, and feel sure that the Minister of Highways will see that our roads are adequately looked after. The program since the war has been effective, and a great deal has been done.

I would like now to congratulate the Minister of Health and the Minister of Reform Institutions on their appointment to the Executive Council. I am sure that their appointment met with the unanimous approval of the people of the province.

I am sure the Hon. Minister of Health, who represents an adjacent riding will serve Ontario with credit and distinction. He understands the problems of

the people, the municipalities, the doctors and the hospitals. I was glad to see a statement made by him in which he said more attention should be given to the people of moderate means who today find it difficult to pay hospital and medical costs. The rich do not have to worry about the cost. The poor don't need to worry, the municipality pays it, but the men and women in between -- the forgotten men and women -- are the ones who suffer. If the Minister can work out a system to help this group, he will be everlastingly remembered.

I would like to commend the Department of HealthHealth of the Province for the increased grants to our hospitals, and especially for the extra grants to assist the hospital boards in meeting deficits.

I would like to commend the Hydro Electric Power Commission for the tremendous development in the rural areas during the past year, and for the promise of more mileage in 1951. We owe a debt of gratitude to the dynamic chairman of the Hydro Commission who has done so much for Hydro since his appointment, and not only the Chairman, but the Vice-Chairman, who sits as an hon. member in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear. Hydro has made greater strides in the past four years than in all its history, and Mr. Saunders is the driving force behind it. Again, may I repeat what I said in 1949, i.e., we should have a flat rate in Hydro

throughout the whole Province. The small villages and towns in this Province have a right to expect a similar rate to the rate that exists in the larger centres. These villages and towns would like to have industry locate in their areas, but how in the world can these industries settle in these smaller communities when they have to pay 50% to 100% more for power than is charged in the large cities. I venture to say that our industrial potential would be almost ruined overnight with our industry centralized in the larger cities. When you think of the tremendous power of the atomic bomb, how long would it take to put us out of commission? Even in Russia they have gone to great pains to rectify this condition. They have not centralized all their industry in the large centres. They have dispersed it all over the country. If equal hydro rates were given to all centres in Ontario, industry itself would decentralize. Since Hydro is a public-owned utility, surely there should be equal rates all over the province. A flat rate for Hydro power would enable Collingwood, Orangeville, Alliston, Stayner and other towns and villages in my constituency to secure industry and provide employment for their citizens.

I do not think I should forget the Department of Labour in this little resume. I would like to go up and down the aisles and speak of every department, because each one has made a great contribution to the prosperity and welfare of the people of the province of Ontario. But time will not permit me to speak of

every department. I would like to commend the Minister of Labour in this Province. This Department is a very difficult one, and the Minister is doing a magnificent job.

MR. MAC LEOD: A very difficult Minister.

MR. DOWNER: I do not think we could get a better Minister of Labour any place in the province of Ontario, than the one we have here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOWNER: Much of the credit for the industrial peace that prevails in this province is due to his efforts.

MR. MacLEOD: He is a very nice fellow.

MR. DOWNER: It is not altogether his wisdom, but he is so genial, as his colleagues around the table all agree. Our working people are entitled to good wages and reasonable hours. The standard of living in this Province is especially high, and our working people are entitled to the best there is. During the Session several items of Labour Legislation were passed that will add to the security and welfare of our working people. I was amazed the other night to hear the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Chartrand) speak about the tremendous plans for development going on in the province of Quebec. No one is more pleased than I to see our sister provinces going ahead, but I would like to remind the hon. member (Mr. Chartrand) of the tremendous expansion which is taking place in the province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOWNER: Let us be loyal to our own province. I would like to say, too, that this boom is largely due to the stability and soundness of this government and its policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOWNER: During the past years we have experienced a boom in Canada, amounting to an increase of twenty-one percent in our investments, the greatest boom that has ever come to this province.

MR. DENNISON: All that has got us is inflation.

MR. DOWNER: This is something I perhaps should have said when I was talking about old-age pensions a few minutes ago.

MR. MacLEOD: You dropped it like a hot potato.

(Page E-16 follows)

Now, about the Department of Public Welfare. I don't think any department of the government is closer to the great majority of the poeple than this department, and the Minister is to be congratulated on the job that is being done for our senior citizens. I am glad to know that at long last the Means Test for for old age pensioners over the age of 70 is to be removed. This is a move that is long overdue, but even that is not enough. A pensioner should be allowed to earn at least $500. a year. In these days of inflation, pensioners need the extra money to live on.

May I also add my voice once again to that of other honourable Members who have asked for a pension for the hopelessly crippled and chronic invalids who are unable to provide for themselves. These people should be helped. They have as much right to our sympathy and our help as have those who are blind. This is a humane thing to do and should be done now by this House.

This is not the time to worry about our political futures, but it is the time that all honest men and women of all political parties who love freedom and liberty, and who appreciate our way of life, to get together to restrain those who seek to destroy freedom and liberty and democracy in Canada.

Again, may I plead, before I sit down, for those who served in the armed services during war years. Many of them are over 45 years old, and as such they are not

eligible for the Ontario Civil Service. I would like to see something done for this group. Let us give them an opportunity of working for the government, even though they are over 50. They were ready to give their all for the country; surely we can waive a few of these conditions that prevent them from working here.

We are fortunate indeed to have a man such as Mr. Frost for Prime Minister. Under his guidance and direction Ontario will remain strong, her people happy and contented. The Prime Minister has produced another balanced budget, with no new taxes.

I am sure Old Man Ontario appreciates a Government that is strong, progressive, humane and dependable.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I was about to suggest that you call it twelve by the clock.

Before I sit down may I enquire from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) whether he will be prepared when the House meets again this afternoon to table the documents he has promised us several times during this Session? I refer in particular to the broadcast.

MR. PORTER: I will table them this afternoon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How about the Lands and Forets broadcasts?

MR. PORTER: I do not know anything about that.

MR. SCOTT: It was not prepared in any way by the Department of Lands and Forests but by the C.B.C. officials.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They say it was prepared in collaboration with the Department of Education.

MR. PORTER: These programs are prepared by the C.B.C. and they are submitted to an official of the Department of Education who looks over them. Apparently in this case he did not consider there was any reason for referring it to any department of government. He simply checked it to the best of his ability.

MR. SCOTT: Was it good?

MR. PORTER: The C.B.C. prepares them and takes the full responsibility for what goes into them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I take it that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) agrees with me that we should be entitled to see such broadcasts?

MR. PORTER: We have to get it from the C.B.C. I have not been asked for that one. I was asked to table

some broadcasts and I said I would table a series of VIP broadcasts.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is that?

MR. PORTER: It means "Very Important Persons". As far as the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) is concerned, he is not on that yet.

MR. MACLEOD: Just table the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) instead.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why should they not be tabled now?

MR. PORTER: We will table them this afternoon.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why is it necessary to delay this painful process until the last minutes of the Session?

MR. SPEAKER: It being twelve of the clock I do now leave the Chair until by my time two of the clock but according to the time of the clock two thirty p.m.

MR. FROST: When it is two thirty p.m. it will be recognized as two o'clock by Mr. Speaker's time.

MR. SPEAKER: That is correct.

- - - - - - - - - -

The House recessed at 1.10 of the clock p.m.

THIRD SESSION

of the

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

of the

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

- - - - - - - - - - -

TORONTO, ONTARIO, APRIL 5, 1951, et seq.

- - - - - - - - - - -

VOLUME XLIII

THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 1951

(AFTERNOON SESSION)

- - - - - - - - - - -

HON. (Rev.) M.C. DAVIES, - Speaker

R.C. STURGEON
Chief Hansard Reporter
Parliament Buildings
TORONTO

HON. L. M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No.22.

HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 22nd Order, second reading of Bill No.84, "An Act to Amend the Highway Improvement Act", Mr. Houck.

MR. W. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No.84.

I rather feel in rising at this time, in the closing hours of the Session of the Legislature, like the ball-player who is on the losing side,with the score 9-0, two men out, and two strikes against him. However, I will not be unfair nor unjust in unduly taking too much time in explanation of this Bill.

The new draft of Section 93 of the old Act introduced by the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in the Session of 1950, simply re-enacts some of the sections of Bill No.93. There are a few small, minor changes in some of the wording , for instance, that which allows private pole lines to be erected to carry telephone lines into private residences in a prohibited area. It also limits in some respects the power of the Hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) in regard to ordering the removal of signs, trees, and so forth now in existence, bordering the highways. It also eliminates the 600-foot square and also provides that the Hon. Minister may remove what he considers to be certain

traffic hazards.

But the Queen Elizabeth Highway is wide enough to permit roadside stands. We have picnic tables, that offer the same hazard, and also the drive-in places all along the highway.

This provides for compensation, and that was taken up in the Act introduced by the Hon. Minister (Mr. Doucett) during this Session.

Sub-section 7 provides for personal or substitutional service by way of a judge. According to the Act of 1950, a man can be notified simply by registered mail, and he may be away on a vacation, down south, or some place, and if it was the wish of the Minister, he would be deemed to have received the notice, and the buildings could have been torn down before he got home. I think there is some 8,000 miles of King's highways, which are affected by this enactment. A lot of these homesteads have been handed down from the Crown, and I think steps should be taken to give the owners further protection. Many people are making a fine livelihood in the operation of these fruit stands, and I think restrictions should be lifted.

I am asking the Government to seriously consider this Bill.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in connection with this Bill which was read for the second time, on motion by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck), may I say that at this

time it is rather disappointing, in 1951, that the hon. member (Mr. Houck) should feel that we should take a step backward from a bill which was passed in 1938.

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that this amendment this afternoon, as moved by the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) is, in fact, if I understand the purpose, the Bill introduced last year is almost identical with the one introduced in 1939. We call them "controlled access limited highways", which means about the same thing, and comes into conformity with many bills across the country.

Formerly, under the old Act, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may make regulations relating to divided highways. The regulations were drafted, almost identically with those which we have in the Act of 1950. The only thing was that under the old Act, it did not stand up when it went before the courts, and we changed it to read:

> "Notwithstanding any general or special Act, regulation, by-law or other authority, no person shall, except under a permit therefor, from the Minister --"

Which really gives a greater latitude than the Act of 1939.

I think it comes down to one point, that in the province of Ontario, a great province, with its rapid expansion and great increase in population, and

an immense increase in motor registration, we have to make up our minds whether we are going to have controlled access, highways, or not. There is no way that I see, from the experiences in the United States and from our own experiences, that we can have a half-way measure.

I realize, as the hon. member (Mr. Houck) has said, that there may be some hardship in some cases, but after all, the average controlled access highway in the province of Ontario is absolutely new roadway, with the exception of one from Toronto to Hamilton. I think practically all of the others are. We have a new highway under construction at the present time leading from the boundary of the city of Toronto to Barrie, and we hope that the Act we introduced last year will apply to that.

That is coming back to a point mentioned here yesterday, and on other occasions during this Session, when different hon. members -- and rightly so -- expressed their opinions and their concern about the safety of our travelling public.

The Queen Elizabeth Way is one controlled access highway, which is well-known to all of us. It has been opened about five years. Sixty-nine persons have lost their lives on the road, but when we check, we find the majority of those accidents were due to the entry of cross-roads onto the Queen Elizabeth Way.

Last year I mentioned in the Legislature

the Government's proposal to start at the earliest possible date with the constructing of a new highway from Windsor to Hamilton and then on to the city of Toronto, and then the road extending from Oshawa on the east. And naturally, it was to be a controlled access limited road. Sometimes we are a little forgetful about the population and where the density of it really is. This area from Windsor / following a line across Ontario, and into Whitby and along Lake Ontario contains 20% of the total registrations of the province of Ontario, and we have in the same area 68% of the total population of the province of Ontario. This, in itself, will tell you if we are going to build roads which will give reasonable safety to our people, and to do that, we must put forth our very best efforts. I think that is what the Government of the day had in mind in 1939 when they introduced into this House the Act for divided highways, in the days when the Hon. member (Mr. Houck) sat on the Government side and when he voted, no doubt, for the Bill.

This is more or less a local problem in the vicinity where this particular highway goes, and is one which I say -- and I say in all sincerity -- should not be thought of in any political way, but only in the light of the future of the people of the Province of Ontario, and for the safety of our travelling public.

It is estimated a couple of million/cars may go over this road in question. Two of the very largest

entering points for the American tourists into the province of Ontario are at Niagara Falls and Fort Erie. In fact, it is increasing since 1949, when from the figures available there were 792,320 cars entered, and Fort Erie had 1,412,912, which gives you some idea of the tremendous tourist entries at these two points.

There is another point of entry, that of Windsor, and the figures I have from there show that there were 1,882,000/odd entered there. These controlled access highways are not new. Many states of the union have had a lot of experiences, and we in the provinces of Ontario have seen some of them. In fact, if our figures are right, back in 1932 we built a road extension, and enacted a new Act to control it. What happened? The road, as far as the safety factors are concerned, into the city of Toronto, is gone. It is through all these built-up areas, and it can only allow about 25 miles an hour in traffic with any kind of reasonable safety.

There have been some experiences in many of the states of the union, one of which I might mention. In the State of California, a few years ago they built a road some 500 or 600 miles long from Los Angeles at a cost of one million dollars per mile, and within five years of its being built, due to the heavy traffic and the building up of the area surrounding it, they were compelled to revert to a 25-mile an hour zone, and the state moved over

to another place and build a fast and safe road.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to quote a statement from one of the outstanding authorities, a very outstanding American authority, Mr. Wilfred Owen, who sums it up, I think, very nicely in this fashion:

> "Many highways built in recent years were considered to be the ultimate in modern design, yet it was not long before they were failing to provide reasonably adequate service. This early obsolescence was in part the result of rapid growth in traffic volume, and in part it was the result of a mistaken concept of the functions the highway could perform. They have preserved not only the physical facilities inherited from the days of the horse and buggy, but the physical philosophy which was involved with it. Ever since highways have been built to perform two functions; one is to provide transportation from one point to another; the second is to furnish access to land. A modern highway for high speed, and heavy volume traffic, is no longer able to perform both of these services respectively."

I think that is what we have all learned from experience, that it is utterly impossible to build a road which can furnish both of these services.

He then goes on to say:

"When a new highway is constructed to-day, its ability to provide for the safe and expeditious movement of motor vehicles is promptly reduced, and property owners exercise their right to tap a new artery, either for personal access, or for the establishment of commercial facilities. This development generally results in frequent stopping, parking and unexpected entrances and exits of slow-moving vehicles, all of which reduce the speed of through traffic, limit the capacity of the road, multiply traffic hazards, and ultimately render the road unfit as a transportation facility."

That is what will happen in this Province of Ontario, if this Bill, which the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) has introduced, goes into effect. In regard to this Bill, he states:

"(a) place, erect or increase the size of any building, structure, gasoline pump or fence, or any part thereof, or place any tree, shrub, or hedge, or any part thereof, upon or within 150 feet of any limit of a controlled-access highway, or within the triangle formed by drawing a straight line from a point distant 600 feet along the limits of a controlled-access highway to a point distant 600 feet along the limits of a highway intersecting or running into

such controlled-access highway, the said 600 feet in each case being measured from the point of intersection of the said highways;

(b) place, erect or increase the size of any power line, pole line or other transmission line, or any part thereof, upon or within one-quarter mile of any limit of a controlled-access highway; provided that nothing herein contained shall prevent the construction and maintenance of a private pole line required to supply electricity and telephone service to the owners or occupants of any buildings legally erected on any lands within one-quarter mile of such controlled-access highway;

(c) place, erect or increase the size of any sign, notice or advertising device, or any part thereof, other than a sign not more than two feet by one foot displaying the name of the owner or occupant of the premises to which it is affixed or the name of such premises, upon or within one-quarter mile of any limit of a controlled-access highway;

(d) construct, use or allow the use of

> any private road, entranceway or gate which, or any part of which, is connected with or opens upon a controlled-access highway; provided that where such private road, entranceway or gate is the only reasonable means of access to a highway for the owner or occupant of lands abutting on the said controlled-access highway, the Minister shall grant a permit authorizing the use of such private road, entranceway or gate."

If we do that, we have destroyed entirely the use of the terms by which this road is designated. I think we have got to be serious about this. Are we in the province of Ontario, with its rapid growth, and increasing registration, going to spend some $300,000 or $400,000 of our people's money per mile in building roads such as this, and then let commercial entrances build up along them, or houses built with entrances from the main highway, making the highway unsafe for the general public? If that is the wish of the people of the province of Ontario, then I would say as the Minister administering the Department of Highways: "The sooner we get away from controlled-access highways, the better, because we are only wasting public money."

But in pointing out to you the population which is growing, and which will increase in these

areas, I think every sensible thinking man in this House, and in the Province of Ontario will agree this is something we must get on with to develop Ontario, to give it speedy roads and safe roads upon which to travel.

Now, a word in regard to the fruit stands; I am very happy to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have had many recommendations of our actions on the Queen Elizabeth Highway regarding these fruit stands. It is one of the few roads where we have had much trouble, and that trouble is rapidly fading. I do not mean to condemn those who try to make a lot of money in a short season of the year selling fruit, where we have built a brand-new road, and brought to their gates some fifteen thousand or twenty thousand motor vehicles per day, it is a great potential possibility. From points as far north as Sudbury, the Chambers of Commerce have sent resolutions commending the Government for our action in keeping those roads free from the hazards and dangers to the travelling public.

In the Niagara Peninsula, where the greater amount -- if not the most -- fruits grow in the Province of Ontario, the vegetable and fruit growers, I am happy to say, are happy and pleased with the method they have instituted, and the way in which they will handle this situation.

Last year we opened four markets along the Queen Elizabeth Way, two on each side, and we

let the producers in there to sell their fruit. It was a trial, as I mentioned in the House last year, and we wanted to prove whether it would be satisfactory or not. It is true, probably, as some of you would say, it was in a very primitive stage, but this year we are planning in connection with it, and it will be even better than it was, and if it proves satisfactory, as far as we are concerned, we are going to build onto each one of these stalls in the back, whereby the producers can sell their fruits and vegetables, and the stalls in the front under cover where you can drive in with your car and make your purchase, and at the end of them, we will have a decelerating lane for exits, and an accelerating lane, for entrances which will be reasonably safe for the other users of the road.

There was a great deal said about this, and I would like to read a resolution received from the Fruit and Vegetable Growers of Niagara:

"Moved by Mr. J. S. Stork, seconded by Mr. John Secord:

'Whereas; the Department of Highways has seen fit to erect a stand to provide facilities for the sale of fruits and vegetables on the Queen Elizabeth Highway, and;

Whereas; we appreciate that this is a main highway connected with the United States an highly industrial area, and;

Whereas; this highway may have to be enlarged

to take care of ever-increasing traffic; Therefore be it resolved; that we, the Directors of the Niagara Peninsula Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association appreciate their efforts thus far and would suggest that the Highway Department further develop the idea of local markets at various intervals under the supervision of the Highway Department and the Fruit Inspection Department, having regard to the safety of the travelling public, and in keeping with the dignity and beautification of the highway, and that a Committee of three be appointed to present this resolution to the Minister of Highways."

I think that speaks very well for the satisfaction expressed for the services we have been attempting to give to the fruit-growers in that area during our first year of trial. This year we are going to go much beyond that in the erection of buildings for which we already have plans.

I do not want to take up too much time, but I do say to the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) that this Bill does just exactly -- or almost exactly what was intended in the Bill of 1939. The only thing was there was that loop-hole which did not seem to hold water, but now I think we have got it tightened, and I say in all sincerity to the hon.

members of this House that I think we must go forward, and if we are going to develop Ontario as I think we are all anxious to do, if we are going to improve the safety of our people, I think it can only be done by education.

(Take BB follows.)

I think one of education, and one which everyone of us has a duty to help develop. It is not move that we, this Government, has brought in, but it is one which we want to go forward with and I hope we will have the support of the hon. membersof this House and of the people of the Province of Ontario. After all, it is a big job to do. We have done our best, where a new of road of this type is laid out, to keep along the back line of the farm, destroying the very minimum of property and making the access as easy as possible. In each and every case, of course, we p ay for damages. It was one of the clerks of the Department of my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) who stated that in the Act which we introduced last year, there was compensation provided for. I am rather inclined to agree with him, but, to make doubly sure this year, I introduced an amendment and put it there very definitely. On no occasion have we ever tried to force the taking of property without considering compensation. It was never the thought of the Department to move buildings without such. That is one of the powers we must have if we are going to go on and build access highways.

Mr. Speaker, I speak, I think, for the Government when I say that this Government has given very careful and serious consideration to this problem and in order for us to go forward with this great transportation system which we have in Ontario, one of which we are very proud, that we are in favour of the

controled access limited roads, if we are going to serve our people in the way they should be served in a great Province such as the Province of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed; second reading of the Bill.

On Bill no. 84.

Motion negative.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: (Prime Minister): Order number sixteen.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixteenth order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

(Page BB - 3 Follows)

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, at this late hour in the Third Session of the Twenty-Third Legislature I have no desire to detain the house unduly, although there are some things of importance I wish to say. Fortunately, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) in speaking this morning dealt very effectively and logically, I thought, with the subject of conservation. I associate myself entirely with his remarks on that subject. What he has said makes it unnecessary for me to take time in that regard. I have only this to add with respect to the important points raised by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), that Ontario happens to be one of those parts of the world which is responsible for producing a surplus of food and of other commodities. It is therefore of great importance to the future security of the world that the productivity of the land in Ontario, of the forests in Ontario, of the mines in Ontario and of the factories in Ontario should be as high as possible. Our role for many years to come will be not only to improve our own standard of life, but to make a very substantial contribution towards the relief and rehabilitation of other lands and towards improving the standard of life in other countries. For that reason, if for no other, it is not any more important in any place in the world, than it is in Ontario to give more attention than has been given to the conservation and the productivity of the land and of the other natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity of saying that in the year 1939, I believe, this Province, this City and these buildings were visited by their Majesties, the King and Queen. That was an event of great significance to everybody in Ontario. There are many in this country who know the United Kindom as their mother land, their place of birth or their place of ancestral origin; there are many others who look to other lands as their mother lands. We are not forgotten, I am happy to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this City and these buildings will be visited to-morrow by the President of France. I am sure that every member of this House is well aware, that, for large numbers of Canadians, France is the country of ancestral origin to which we all owe a great deal. It is, therefore, with pleasure and satisfaction that I look at the tricolour in this Chamber today and I say, Mr. Speaker, "Vive la France."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. members of this House, like the electors we represent, are concerned with, possibly, five different fields of public service. We are concerned with the Executive Council, that is with the government and its responsibilities; we are concerned with the Legislature and its function in our democracy; we are concerned with the public service usually known as the Civil Service of Ontario; and there is a fourth branch of public service which grows in importance year by year, namely, the Commissions, the Government Commissions and other

businesses which serve the people under authority of The Hydro Electric Power Commission and other Commissions established by this House. We also have a large and important group of public servants who may be found in the municipalities where they serve under and by virtue of legislation which was also passed in this House and where they play a very important part in the life of our people. My remarks to-day will be addressed particularly to the role of this Legislature.

There are some comments I want to make about our experience in this House, some suggestions for improvement. May I say, first of all, that efficient legislative work in this House depends a great deal on the efficiency of the Government. Of necessity most important public Bills must be introduced by the Government. I would suggest that in future, in fairness to the House, in fairness to the Government and in fairness to the people we represent, the Government should make a more serious effort to bring important legislation before the House reasonably early in the Session.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This Session we have seen major Government legislation introduced very late in the day. It was frequently in a form which required much reconsideration and amendment, sometimes re-amendment and then again re-amendment. We have seen the postponement until the eleventh hour of many Bills which must surely have been on the agenda of the Government for months, or even for years past. They come along in the fifth or sixth,

or seventh, or eighth week of the session. Then, of course, the tendency is to ask the House to give them speedier consideration. Speedy consideration is all very well in its place but it can sometimes mean insufficient consideration. I think the Government is at fault in not having made a more successful effort at this Session particularly to introduce important legislation in a well-considered form much earlier in our two months of Session.

Secondly, I want to say that I think the revision of our rules is long overdue.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. UOLLIFFE: I am personally inclined to be enough of a conservative -- with a small "c" -- and a tradionalist to be very suspicious about tinkering with the rules of a democratic body such as this, but nevertheless, I do think that our rules ought to be more appropriate than they are now when they are seldom observed scrupulously. We all know that on every day of this Session, the rules have been broken, by unanimous consent, no doubt, because they just did not fit the needs of the day. It seems to me it would be far better to have a set of rules which are workable and to be faithful to those rules so that then we would know where we are at. Then it would not be necessary for the Government to rely on the co-operation of the Opposition in order to facilitate the passage of legislation and it would not be necessary for the Opposition, on occasion, to rely on the generosity of the Government in order to do

what obviously ought to be done.

I may say in this connection that this Opposition, at least, has been remarkably tolerant of the Government's daily violation of rules; but we were tolerant because we thought was necessary and because we do not wish to become involved in a serious controversy about procedural matters if it can be avoided. I do say it is high time we brought the rules up to date and in doing so we ought to make sure that provision is made for giving due consideration and mature consideration to all legislation, for permitting every hon. member to make his position clear at the appropriate time and for the transaction of all business, without the haste and the strain which has been all too evident at every Session during which I have been a member of the House.

I want to say a word about our distinguished friends, without whom the Government would fail and without whom I would have a very weak voice, indeed, namely, the so-called"back-benchers". I share the views of some Conservatives and of some Liberals with whom I have discussed this matter on a good many occasions. At Ottawa and also in this House, the back-benchers, so called, and particularly the Government back-benchers, to not get enough to do in a legislative capacity. Mr. Speaker, I give them full credit for the work they do in a representative capacity. I know that hon. members on all sides of this House are zealous in the service of their constituents. They do a great deal of work representing their constituents, dealing with the Civil

Service, straightening out individual problems and the like; but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, as a very prominent member of the Conservative Party, said to me the other day in regard to the situation at Ottawa, they do not get enough to do in a legislative capacity. It is bad for them, it is bad for the Government and it is bad for all legislation. Indeed, when we were discussing the matter at Ottawa my Conservative friend said that he felt [illegible] sorry for the Government back-benchers than for anybody else in the House. There is little inducement given them to return to the House. I can think of some distinguished Canadians who served in the House of Commons at Ottawa as Government back-benchers and who deliberately withdrew from public life because the duties of a back-bencher were to them wearisome, pointless and futile. They returned to the old activities in which they were used to engage because they did not have enough to do in keeping with their capacity to make a contribution. I think it is probably true, as others have suggested to me, that the inactivity, the sense of frustation so often experienced by Government back-benchers is one of the things which leads to the ultimate downfall of a Government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: My suggestion, of course, has on previous occasions been that back-benchers could do more important and constructive work if we made better use of Committees. As the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows, there are many people in all parties who share my view

about that matter. I hesitate to say anything more about Committees, because I have been active in promoting them. I must say the results produced to date in many cases are not very impressive, although some work has been well begun.

I would ask the House to look back over the record or Committees appointed during the last seven or eight years and just recall the batting average of these Select Committees and Standing Committees of the House. It is not very high. In most cases, they were slow to meet, they met very seldom in most cases and when they eventually adopted a report in most cases nothing was done about it. I could mention the Election Committee of 1944, and the Rules Committee which came a little later, another Election Committee appointed, I believe, in 1949, another one appointed in 1950, the Indemnities Committee, and a host of others. These were Committees which put in a certain amount of time working, which received praise for their wisdom, but little or nothing has been done about it.

In connection with Committee s now pending, I suggested -- and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) eventually expressed accord with the suggestion -- that there should be Committees to consider the work of Government Commissions and to consider the work of that great and important Department known as Lands and Forests. I made that suggestion very early in the Session, the first week in February. The Committees were not appointed until, I think, about a month later. They have met.

MR. FROST: Not more than ten days ago.

MR. JOLLIFFE: They were not appointed until some time in March. I raised the matter the first week in February. The Committees were appointed some time in March. They did not meet --whatever reason may have been given -- the fact is they did not meet until after the Easter adjournment. How could matters of such great importance be effectively discussed or examined after the Easter adjournment? The result, of course, was that during the last week, Committees have been meeting at the same time. On one morning we had the Committee on Printing meeting, the Committee on Game and Fish meeting, the Committee on Agriculture meeting, and the Committee on Government Commissions. With respect to the Committee on Indemnities its proceedings were so shrouded in the mists of antiquity, or something, I never did know when they were meeting, I did not know until this morning.

I would suggest that there need not be so much timidity about trusting these Committees with more work. Indeed, whatever may be said about the previous Government by the hon. members opposite or by this group, at least the previous Government was not afraid to let a Committee go into Lands and Forests and go into Hydro and I commend to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) the courage, the daring of Mr. Hepburn, on the 24th day of February, 1940, when it transpired that a Committee previously appointed to go into Lands and Forests had held certain sittings but had not completed its work. Mr. Hepburn on that day moved, seconded by Mr. Leduc:

> "that the Select Committee of this House appointed by the House on Tuesday, April 28th, 1939, to investigatek enquire into and report upon all matters pertaining to the administration, licensing,sale, supervision and conservation of natural resources by the Department of Lands and Forests, is hereby authorized to sit during the recess following the present Session of this Assembly, and that the said Select Committee shall have full power and authority to call for persons, etc."

I need not read the rest of the resolution. There was a case in which Mr. Hepburn certainly was not afraid to delegate to a Committee the necessary authority. Mr. Hepburn was not too timid, too fearful to allow the Committee on Lands and Forests to go on functioning after the Session ended. He moved a resolution that it should do so. I do not know what the views of the hon. members of the present Committee on Lands and Forests are about that, but I do know that under the rules of this House its existence expires when the House is prorogued unless the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) sees fit to move a resolution such as Mr. Hepburn moved. Speaking for myself I would be very much interested to see if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is in a position to do to-day what Mr. Hepburn did on February 24th, 1940. I will await the result with interest.

In the case of the Committee on Government Commissions, it was appointed to enquire into the affairs of these important Commissions. It had, I think, some very useful meetings with The Hydro/Electric Power Commission, with Mr. Saunders, the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies), with Mr. Strike and others. I believe there were three meetings of that Committee. Most of the time was taken up in the presentation of written information by Mr. Robert Saunders. I say it was all very useful. Personally I found it so. I wish to assure the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr.Challies) that I have no fault to find with the presentations which were made in that particular form. It may have been bulky but, after all, the subject is a bulky one. When you have other Government Commissions, such as the Ontario Northland, where the Committee has not had a chance to do anything, again the Government should not be so cautious or so timid -- I hope that is a parliamentary word -- about enquiring into these matters. The Government need not be apprehensive about its Committees occupying undue time in enquiring into those matters. I have a suspicion that the hon. members of this House are going to be rather busy for the next few months and I do not think that they are going to waste time in Committee meetings when they have many other duties to discharge. It happens that in the case of that Committee it actually passed a resolution favouring the continuation of its work. I say that because I do not know whether it has been officially brought to the notice of the

hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I do not recall whether the Committee has reported, but I say now, in order that the House will know the result, that the Committee, itself, the Government Commissions Committee, Tuesday passed a resolution recommending in effect that it should be authorized to sit during the recess. Again I will await with interest the result. We shall be interested to know whether the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) is as bold or as daring as Mr. Hepburn was in 1940.

There is another point on which we rebuke the Government for its extraordinary timidity, that is, in connection with Questions. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) seems to be under the impression that the matter of asking questions and getting answers is simply a little courtesy which somehow grew up over the years and if the Government feels the questions are useful and if it has the time it will, perhaps, get around to answering them. That is not the record, at all, as far as questions are concerned. In listening to the hon. Prime Minister speaking on the subject, one would never have suspected there is a rule in this House about questions, that is rule 37, which is to be found on page 110 of Major Lewis' book on Parliamentary Procedure in Ontario. The rules does not say that an hon. Minister must answer a question, but it makes it perfectly clear that it is an established procedure of the House, subject to certain restrictions. It certainly implies that questions are to be put and are to be answered.

"Questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members relating to any Bill, motion or other public matter connected with the business of the House in which such members may be concerned, but, in putting any such question, no argument or opinion is to be offered, nor any fact stated; and , in answering any such question, a member is not to debate the matter to which the same refers. Such questions and the replies thereto shall be in writing and shall be entered in the Journals".

It is not a matter of courtesy, but is dealt with in the rules.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE:

"Whenever any question requires, by way of reply thereto, any statement of facts, or records, or statistics of a lengthy or voluminous nature or other material, which, in the opinion of the Minister whose Department is concerned, should be made the subject of a Return, the Minister may, instead of answering such question, require a motion to be made for a Return".

I do not think it is necessary for me to read from Major Lewis' comments on that rule, the background of the rule, the application of the rule, because the hon. members all know it is there and they can consult it. The point is that questions under our procedure are not a all what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) represented them to be. I will say this about the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost): he has often been accused at this Session of vain, glorious boasting and undue vanity, but I feel otherwise about the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost). I reproach the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for having such an inferiority complex. He should not feel this way about entrusting matters of public importance to Committees or permitting hon. Committee members to learn a little more about the business of the Province. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should not feel so timid about answering questions which may, possibly, prove embarrassing. I assure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) he is a pretty good campaigner, he takes care of himself fairly well in a battle. Whence comes this fear of getting involved in something which might, perchance, be embarrassing or difficult? The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) need not suffer from such an inferiority complex about that subject. Naturally some of the questions which have been put might lead to embarrassing results.

I have been looking at some of these questions. I observe that, although we were told yesterday about the hundreds of Civil Servants who would have to work

day and night to get the answers to th e questions, there are many of them which are far from being in that category. For example, I wonder how many hundreds of Civil Servants would have to work day and night to dig up the answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon), number 256, which has not been answered yet. It is still on the order paper.

> "Enquiry of the Ministry -- What is the retainer fee paid to Doctor Hogg from the H.E.P.C.? "

How many hundreds of Civil Servants would have to work day and night to get the answer to that question?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The answer to that question could be supplied in approximately 35 seconds. Of course, it may be that the government does not want to answer the question. They may feel that the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Gordon) is a disgraceful fellow for having raised this question, he should not have asked it.

MR. FROST: I have no objection to answering it. I would point out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that the Hydro staff has been so busy answering other questions, they have not come to that one yet.

Dr. Hogg, I may say, Mr. Speaker, is receiving a retainer feel approximately of $10,000. a year, and, since, his retirement as Commissioner, is earning it and is doing a very excellent job for the Province of Ontario.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is just exactly as I said; it

took less than 35 seconds to answer the question.

MR. FROST: I point out, when all the staff and stenographers are working on these other questions, they do not get around to digging these things out.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I doubt very much that the Hydro staff is as inefficient as that remark would suggest. I doubt that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) need suffer from the inferiority complex which obviously affects him when he tries to sidestep some of these questions.

Let us mention the very first question, I think, on the order paper. I refer to the question asked by the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail), No. 17, put by the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail), on the first day of February. The hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) wants to know how many persons were in receipt of mothers' allowances and what was the total number of their dependents. As if that question could not be answered in two minutes' time, or as if it would entail the work of hundreds of civil servants.

I think the Hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) is a good Minister, but I may say that if the Hon. Minister of Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) and his staff have not those answers at their command, they are just unbelievably inefficient, they do not know anything about the work of the Department. I can only conclude that they know the answer, because I do not think either the Hon. Minister (Mr. Goodfellow) or his staff are inefficient. They do not have enough respect for the

established rights of hon. members of this House to provide us with an answer.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Referring to Question No. 229, which is the last one I will mention, although I could mention many more, asked by the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Scott):

(TAKE "CC" FOLLOWS)

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is a perfectly proper question relating to the Ontario Provincial Police. He wanted to know how many members of the Provincial Police Froce in each of the years 1943 to 1950 inclusive were retired compulsorily, retired voluntarily, resigned, or were discharged. It is a very proper question to ask about the public affairs of this province.

After all, the hon. member (Mr. Scott - Beaches) asked that question on behalf of people who are tax payers and who finance the operations of the Provincial police, and are entitled to receive an answer to those questions in which they are interested.

I say the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should put aside the timidity which he evinces at certain times. He is a very competent Prime Minister, and should have no fear about getting into any controversy in regard to these matters.

Some time ago -- about 400 years, to be exact -- John Donne said:

"I have done one braver thing
"Than all the worthies did;
"And yet a braver thence doth spring,
"Which is to keep that hid."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now, Mr. Speaker, possibly the trouble arises from the be-setting sin of politicians in this country. The greatest be-setting sin, in my opinion, is not that they fall into graft and corruption but that they will not face up to the issues. They run away from the issues on almost

every difficult occasion. Perhaps we have all been guilty of that at one time or another. Certainly, the present government of Ontario cannot be absolved from responsibility for its failure to face up to the most important questions of the day.

In regard to the question of civil defence, for instance, which we raised before the Session, and which was discussed briefly early in the Session, and again in the Estimates, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows that is an important issue, and the provincial role in the Civil Defence program is certainly an important and urgent issue. I asked the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to give some thought to the suggestion I made and to state what conclusions have been reached by the government. Since then we have heard nothing more about it, and I suspect we will not get an answer for some time.

There is another question from which too many people are running away. It is too embarrassing; it is one of the greatest problems which has faced this province for some time, one at which the government has only been nibbling, because of its timidity, yours and ours, if you want us to share the blame - the problem of municipal governments and their authority in relationship with the province. Their legislative authority and their economic position is governed by an Act which is now over 100 years old, and which we have amended in bits and pieces for the last century; the conflicting, timid steps which have been taken toward the solution of that problem is something which will be very interesting to read about in history some day. We have not had the leadership

and courage to face up to the needs in that regard.

Most of all, the government and this House have not had the courage to face the issue of inflation. There have been some references made to this difficult question, usually with a side-long glance at Ottawa, and references to the Federal Government's responsibility. I do not pretend that the responsibility is not the responsibility of Ottawa, but I do not see why this House should not take a position on a matter such as this, when practically everybody else in the country is being driven to take a position. Why, Mr. Speaker, whatever we may think about our newspapers, at least even they have ceased to run away from that issue.

I hold in my hand a copy of The Toronto Daily Star, ordinarily a warm supporter of the Federal government, and it says this today, about this issue, and it is a very important press supporter of the government at Ottawa. It reads:

> "Living Costs Up Nearly 10% in Year
>
> On March 1, 1950, Canada's cost-of-living index stood at 163.7.
>
> On March 1, 1951, the index stood at 179.7.
>
> The increase in 12 months is therefore 16 points or nearly 10 per cent.
>
> During November the index rose .4 points, during December an additional 1.4 points, during January an additional 2.7 points, during February an additional 4.5 points to an index of 179.7 on March 1.

> There has thus been an increase of 9 points in four months, or about 5.3 per cent.
>
> The monthly increases are on an ascending scale. The quarterly review of rents was a factor in the latest increase, but accounts for only part of the rise.
>
> Government controls have been too long delayed. Ottawa should act before the situation gets completely out of hand."

And, Mr. Speaker, the editorial concludes with these words:

> " Government controls have been too long delayed. Ottawa should act before the situation gets completely out of hand."

That carries the opinion of the Toronto Daily Star, which is read by hundreds of thousands of people across this country, and, Mr. Speaker, I think it carries the opinion -- at least I believe it does -- of every hon. member of this House, unless I am very wrong.

I have had a resolution on the Order Paper since the 15th of February. I am going to say this to the House by way of explanation, since it was not noticed by everyone; this resolution of mine is framed in the same language as an amendment which was introduced in the House of Commons at Ottawa, for which amendment not only my Leader, and the members of his group have voted, but your Leader, and practically all of the members of his group voted for this amendment.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What are we afraid of?

MR. FROST: I find myself substantially in agreement with the resolution.

MR. DUNBAR: Great Leader, that fellow, Drew.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have made some progress between the 15th of February and the 5th of April. I have got the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to say he is substantially in agreement.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) knows my reasons.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do, and I will agree with them up to a point.

MR. FROST: I do not think we should pass resolutions here directed to the Federal Government.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know the hon. Premier's (Mr. Frost) argument.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) defence has been that it is not within the province of this House to give advice to the Government of Canada. That is a very plausible argument, which has the ring of sound and careful judgment.

MR. FROST: It speaks for itself.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But like so many other statements with an impressive ring, it is only partly true. There are some subjects on which I think it is not the business of this House to give advice to Ottawa. For example, I would question very much whether it is our business to advise Ottawa on the adequacy of our defence program, on how many

destroyers Mr. Claxton should send to Korean waters and the like; on the way hon. Mr. Pearson should vote at the United Nations. Up to that point I agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

But, Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the resolution I placed on the Order Paper is not defence, it is not banking, nor bankruptcy, it is not patents, -- a Federal matter -- it is not a question of external affairs; the subject matter of my resolution is price control in Canada today, a matter with which this government is very much concerned. Why, only today we passed another of a series of amendments to Milk Control Act, which has to do with provincial control of the price of milk, which is one of the factors which enter into the cost of living. I say the province is very much mixed up in this whole question of controls, and the problems of inflation. We are in it right up to our necks, as is evidenced by the headline I showed the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) concerning the rising cost-of-living index. It is not the latest index; it is over one month old. There is a time lag of about two months before we get this information, and the index is going much higher.

Here we have the province, one of the largest employers, having from 13,000 to 15,000 employees, or more. They have to be paid; they have to live, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows perfectly well the magnitude of the problem which confronts him, and which will confront him during the coming year, with the cost of living going up and up, with the Budget which my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) has

worked out on the basis of the early part of this year, and the latter part of last year; it is very obvious it will not provide adequate remuneration for the people who will be hit by the inflation. That is a problem, not only for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) but for all of us. I do not know what it will do to his Budget. I have an idea it may make the Budget look like ancient history, a year from now. But it is certainly removing the last vestige of stability in our economy, and that is something for us to acknowledge when we forecast a surplus or a deficit for the coming year, We all know that the forecasts of the hon. Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in recent years have not been very successful, and I am afraid it will not be any more successful next year, if he is still the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. FROST: Always on the right side, though.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It depends on what you mean by "the right side", and who is paying the bills. After all, the surplus has to come out of somebody's pocket, and from the point of view of the fellow with the pocket, you may not have been on "the right side".

It has been dealt with very effectively, so I will not enlarge on the plight of the pensioners, and all those with fixed incomes. I will not say more about the position of our civil servants, nor about the general public. I will not say much about the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) and his headaches, too. Inflation is a situation which creates far more industrial strife than any of us want to see in the province of Ontario,

I do not like that; I do not think any of us do. But what else can be expected in a situation of this kind? The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) will have to make the best of it, and so will the rest of us. It is one of the most tragic results of inflation.

I would like now to make a brief reference to the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer). We are, to a certain extent, on the same footing in that our fathers were both ministers, and they used to be associated in a small way in one part of the country. The hon. member (Mr. Downer) referred this morning to the need for price and wage controls, but what the hon. member (Mr. Downer) failed to mention, and what some people always refuse to recognize, is that we have had a substantial measure of wage control ever since 1941. If you doubt my word, consider the position of the railroaders last year and the year before. What is the use of pretending we have had no form of wage control, when the railroaders chose to go through all the processes required by law; they were given notice to negotiate, and they negotiated; they sought conciliation, and they received conciliation; they went through conciliation, and they waited the required time, and all during this long waiting period of some fourteen to fifteen months, they did not get a cent; but finally, at long last, after the expiry of the requisite time, they finally went on strike, and the result of that was they got - how much?

MR. DOWLING: Seven cents.

MR. JOLLIFFE: A few cents anyway on account, nearly

16 months after the negotiations started. If that is not wage control, what is it? On the other hand, there were companies in this country that announced price increases overnight, not only once, but two or three, or four, or five times. We have not had price control or a wage-freeze, but we have had a very substantial measure of wage control, and let us not forget that fact when we are discussing such an important subject.

I must also address just a few more words to the hon. Prime Minister and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). He has referred on more than one occasion to a speech I made in this House about seven years ago, a speech in which he thinks I took a very gloomy view of the future. I have pleasure in informing the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that everything I said on that occasion was correct and well-founded. I prophesied great economic difficulties after the end of the war, and I was right. At that time the war was not yet ended, and it has not yet ended. What could be more obvious than the fact that the world has not returned to peace, or anything remotely ressembling peace? Of couse, if all the shooting had stopped in 1945, and if no further crises had followed, if no further disturbances had followed, if we on this continent had failed to give relief to the peoples of Europe and Asia, if we had produced for the purposes of our own consumption only, instead of sending food overseas, a very large part of our production, or if we were not devoting more and more to rearmament, the results would have been disastrous. But a very high level of economic activity has been

maintained, in the main, in the United States, and in Canada as a result of exporting enormous quantities of goods, and food and arms. That is the explanation for the high level of employment on this continent, and also for the measure of inflation from which we are suffering today on this continent. I believe this has brought the world economically closer together, but in addition, it has had many unfortunate results.

I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he of all people should not feel any illusion that the capitalist system has overcome all these difficulties. If you tax enough, borrow enough, spend enough for war purposes and rearmament, perhaps you can keep the system running on a fairly high plane. But that is not the kind of stability I want to see.

Let us realize we are living in days of great uncertainty and great difficulty. And in that connection I would like to mention some of the references which have been made to welfare and security. Occasionally you hear the suggestion that in these times everybody wants to be looked after, everybody wants security, and there is something deplorable about this. I take a different view. I say there has never been a day when there was as much insecurity as there is today. My grandfather and my great grandfather lived at the relatively low standard of life of the Ontario farmer, but they had more security than anybody in this province has today. One of the most disturbing factors throughout the country is that people sense their insecurity. They do not know what next month will bring, and they very properly seek some kind of

national, provincial, or collective protection against the most dangerous hazards of life.

I say we have no apologies to make for the few steps we have taken towards the furthering social security. It is necessary if fewer sufferers from a sense of insecurity are to find their way into the Ontario hospitals directed by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips).

Indeed, we should learn something -- and this is my concluding word in these remarks. We should have learned by this time that the illusion of isolationism must be discarded entirely. That is true in international affairs. We should learn that even though you live in Iowa or Saskatchewan or Ontario, you cannot escape your responsibilities as members of an international community. We have learned that aggression on the other side of the world may well mean aggression against ourselves, and, by the same token, Mr. Speaker, in society itself isolationism must be discarded as an empty illusion. We have to find collective strength and a collective solution for most of our problems. In practice, we are doing something of that sort; we are no longer pinning our faith to free enterprise or a laissez faire economy.

We are living in a mixed economy. You cannot call it a capitalist economy; you cannot call it a socialist economy either, because neither would be exactly correct, because in every sense it just would not correspond with the facts. We have been forced to rely more and more on collective processes, and that is true of governments as well as workers, farmers, and businessmen. I believe the only step toward

achieving success by collective action is to recognize the facts very clearly.

I have a word of praise for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and that is that he has shown his awareness of the interdependence of the provinces of this nation. It is gratifying to hear him say how much he welcomes growth and development in some of our sister provinces, and expresses a wish for their continued success. That is an expression of what is required for collective action and co-operation, and of our interdependence one with the other.

I conclude, again in the words of John Donne, in a sentence which I think is one of the most profoundly significance sentences in the whole treasure house of English literature. It is unforgettable , even though written about 400 years ago, when he says:

"No man is an iland,
"intire of it selfe;
"every man is a peece of the Continent,
"a part of the maine;
"if a Clod bee washed away by the Sea,
"Europe is the lesse,
"as well as if a Promontorie were,
"as well as if a Mannor of thy friends
"or of thine owne were;
"any mans death diminishes me,
"because I am involved in Mankinde;
"And therefore never send to know for
"whom the bell tolls;
"It tolls for thee."

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has said relative to this occasion when we have not only our own grand old flag in this Assembly, but we have the French flag, the tricolour of France. This is the first occasion that flag has ever been flown in this Assembly. This is the day when we are making preparations to receive in this Chamber the head of the French State and it is nice to acknowledge, with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) the contribution the French people have made to the world, and to our own nation because those of French descent who came to the shores of this country some 300 years ago, together with our own forebears, were those who laid the foundation for this great Canada, and this great Ontario of ours.

It is a great pleasure to associate myself with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in acknowledging the great work and the great history of that fine nation and of the descendants of that nation, who live in Canada and are Canadians with us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in winding up this debate, and I believe to a certain extent winding up the Session, although I can well imagine the hon. members opposite will still have something to say, I want to approach this occasion on perhaps a little different basis than I have on other occasions faced this Assembly.

First of all, I would like to associate myself

with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in paying tribute to hon. members of this Assembly and in doing that, I pay tribute to all of them, whether in government or in Opposition, on the back benches or on the front benches. The fact is, in this Assembly we have so much wisdom on the back benches, that all of the benches in this Assembly are really front benches.

(TAKE "DD" FOLLOWS)

MR. Speaker, I should like to disabuse the minds of any of the hon. members, particularly the mind of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), having regard to his remarks, this morning, that I am in any sense a dictator or that I, myself, do all the jobs and work done in this Assembly. That is not the case. It is not my nature to crack the whip. If I have ever cracked the whip, it has been very, very seldom. I cannot recollect an occasion upon which I have done that. By nature I am not a dictator. I can assure the hon. members of this House that -- and I want, first, to pay tribute to them, naturally -- there are no measures introduced in this House without first of all the most careful and patient cabinet consideration. After that, Mr. Speaker, every matter which comes up in this House is referred to the hon. members of the Government. Everything is carefully considered in caucus, before it is brought into this House. That, I think, is a great democratic procedure. I want to acknowledge to those of the hon. members of the Government who are not members of the Executive Council, the contribution the hon. members make to this province and to theLegislation which comes forward in this House. I should like at this time to include a tribute to the hon. members of the Opposition. It is true no one knows more than I do the faults and the failings of the Opposition. No one knows of them more than myself.

No one has been more patient and painstaking in trying to correct those things than myself. I want to pay a tribute to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), a very able gentleman -- and long may he remain the Leader of the Opposition.

I want to pay tribute to the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), an able man with great experience who makes a contribution to this House -- and, as was said here last night -- I have no doubt he will be the next leader of the Liberal Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: We have the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), a man with very great ability, indeed. I want to acknowledge, despite the fact that, by reason of the constitution of this House -- perhaps very often the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) may be left off Committees. But , it is not intentional. No one has a higher regard for the ability of the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) than those of us who sit on this side of the House. For that matter, I want to assure the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) that I would like to see him change his political views. I think the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) would have a great future in this country sitting elsewhere. The hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) looks across here. I think there are places where he could make a greater contribution to Canada and Ontario, were he not sitting where he is.

I would include all the hon. members on the opposite side of the House. The hon. members of the Opposition have made their contribution to this House, and I think, to a very historic session indeed, because this has been an historic session. I am glad to know the Opposition feels we have not ... treated them the way they might have been treated. I think we have given to the hon. members of the Opposition very reasonable consideration, as regards their Bills. I notice now we are down to four bills, the principals of which have all been consedered before. As regards the resolutions, there are two I would very much like to call, but I feel it is a great mistake for us in this Assembly to pass resolutions directed to the senior government, that is, to the Federal Government. Those are some of the things I wanted to say about the hon. members of this House, including the hon. member for St. Andrews (Mr. Salsberg) who made his speech last night -- indeed, a very interesting speech -- regarding his own riding, I am making a speech this afternoon in connection with the hon. members of this House. I want to acknowledge the worth of the hon. members and the contributions they have made, I think, to an historic session in quite an historic Legislature.

The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) mentioned that sometimes I show some irritation. If that is so, I very humbly apologize. always endeavour not to show any irritation. I think, on the other hand,

it will be agreed that, with all the worth of the hon. members of the Opposition, there are times they would try the patience of a saint and I am not a saint. I want to admit the human frailty I have of perhaps occasionally showing impatience, for which, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely apologize.

I want to approach this subject from a different point of view than I have taken previously. I have no desire on this occasion to -- I was going to say --"lambaste" the Opposition. I am not going to say things to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), to the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), to the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) and to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). I thought I would approach this matter from a different angle, that I might at least win some favour from the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) who has counselled me to do that. To-day I am going to take a different point of view, a different angle. I may say that in my remarks it is difficult, perhaps, to keep things from what some of the hon. members might mistakenly say was on a partisan level. That is not my intention. In referring to what has happened in these last few years, it is almost impossible to refrain from drawing to the attention of the House the great works of this Government. If I do that, Mr. Speaker, I do it very humbly. Mr. Speaker, you will understand that. We are living in days in which we see a succession of very great events. Policies often have to be shaped in the light of conditions which are very

urgent. When I look over the days of my early life, from the outbreak of the war in 1914 to the present time, indeed, I look back over days of tremendous almost unbelievable changes and very great events. That has been particularly true of the days of my political life, going back now some 14 years. There has been little place for Mr. Boner Law's tranquility, or for the normalcy referred to by one of the American leaders. These days have been in many ways very hectic and very difficult days in which to live. In referring to the Budget, might I refer to the Budget which I introduced into this House seven years ago, on March 16, 1944. At that time I presented my first budget showing net revenues of $108,000,000. Expenditures for education, I notice at that time, were $16,053,743.43. Mr. Speaker, I often wonder whether we, ourselves, are able to really grasp the magnitude of the days in which we live and the grave events over which we have but little control which shape the lives of ourselves and our offspring. I think that is perhaps one of the difficulties of these days. I often wonder what someone may say fifty or one hundred years from now when they come to write the history of these times. I stood just about in this place seven years ago and introduced budget in the amount of $108,000,000.

On the 6th of March this year I introduced a budget showing a net revenue of $256,000,000. Those things are almost fantastic to consider. Seven years ago I introduced a budget here showing expenditures for education

of a trifle over $16,000,000. In those days, remember, in my first days in this House, we used to consider very carefully what I have said, a trifle over $16,053,743.43. In these days of expansion and change, we have come to overlook those things. I noticed that we have not bothered adding on the cents at the end of the figure of $63,271,000. That is a tremendous thing to tell you. There are some things, of course, from which we can take comfort. One of then is that in these great expenditures, mounting as they have, we have not forgotten the great principles of our forefathers of one hundred years ago who founded this province, when they set out on a great plan in education, a great plan of state education providing for equality of opportunity, for our children. And a plan of state-subsidized education which would be free for our people. We may have forgotten, as a people, many things in these days of great change, but certainly we have not forgotten that. I think to-day the fact we in this Legislature are considering expenditures which account for nearly 25 cents of every one of our dollars, we have done a great thing. I think that is true of the municipalities. Both of the hon. leaders opposite (Mr. Jolliffe and Mr. Oliver) mentioned the matter of the municipal taxpayer. Just imagine seven years ago standing here with a budget providing for assistance to the municipalities in every form of about $23,000,000, built up since this province was founded 150 years ago. Last year that amount had grown to nearly $90,000,000 and this year in excess of $100,000,000,

an increase of $11,000,000, or $12,000,000 in one year. I well remember, as do other hon. members here, that a one-mill subsidy was sufficient to influence the people of Ontario in an election; yet here is an increase to municipalities this year of four times that amount, but because of the days in which we live, very little consideration is given to it by the people.

I should like to say that in these days of tremendous change and alteration, there is always the need to keep one's feet on the ground. I have mentioned that before. I cannot say that I have been quoted with approval by, say, the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), but just the same I think it is a fundamental thing in these days, that we should keep our feet on the ground, that we should always have the opportunity for sound reflection and thought as to the business of our country and the course we are taking.

I should like to say, as Provincial-Treasurer who has now dealt with hundreds of millions of dollars, in my day, that . . . . after all, the most important asset the people of this great province of Ontario has, is the spirit of those people. That is the greatest thing they have. It is the high moral qualities of our people which really count, not bricks, mortar, dollars and cents, but the high moral qualities of our people. That is the real foundation of our greatness, both as a nation and as a province. That is the thing to which we must devote ourselves most

diligently.

Turning to the session immediately at hand, I mention the tremendous changes which have taken place in these years in which we live, the great changes which have taken place over the last decade but even in this present Session, things change so quickly that really we forget great events of a few years ago.

This morning we had the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), an experienced Parliamentarian, one who has seen many things in public life,--in this House get up and say quite frankly of the Budget which was delivered on March 6th, it was difficult for him to recollect what was in the Budget because of the things which have taken place. That is common with our people; that is common with all of us. Just imagine, for instance, rent control. That would be a subject for Debate for a whole Session in the days the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) first became an hon. member of this House. That would be, as I say, a subject for debate for an entire session. It has now passed in this Session and it is just a step. Consider the matter of milk control, for instance. I wonder how much debate there would be on that very great and interesting subject in days gone by. In this historic Legislature, or Session, that has been just an incident.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Quite an incident.

MR.FROST: Yes. I want to say that

legislation, which won the unanimous approval of this House, was, I believe, sound legislation. I believe when we look at the papers and see the jump in cost of living of 4½ points, we can consider that we have made a contribution with respect to which an essential commodity with respect to there has not been any such jump as 4½ points. The fact of the matter is, we have taken sound steps to keep that commodity within control and within limits.

MR. JOLLIFFE: 2½% interest.

MR. FROST: Let me point out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that supposing we had passed legislation here which merely empowered control, I wonder what the price of milk would be in Ontario to-day? Outside of the Toronto area the price of milk is the same. In Toronto, because of the action of the Board, there has been an increase of one-half cent. That is one point I think, in which I agree with the hon. members who spoke the other day, that the control legislation which has been passed by the Federal Government is an invitation to take action and to drive up the prices, and to cause this great cost of living rise we have in this country to-day, which is causing such great trouble.

Let me hurry along. Take, for instance, equal pay for women. Let us consider for example, women on juries. I remember the discussion some dozen years ago, when the matter of women on juries caused such a flurry that a Committee of the House was

appointed -- the Committee we mentioned last night. Women were not put on juries.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): The legislation was withdrawn.

MR. FROST: Yes. This day it passed, and I must admit that because of the succession of great events occurring, perhaps that has been forgotten for something else. Imagine the Bill with respect to fair employment practices! I mentioned a moment ago the effectively one-mill subsidy in this province years ago. About free school books for our children? That will be accomplished when this budget is adopted, in a short time, I hope. That is something which, in other days, would have been a very great thing indeed. Imagine, for instance, after all of the years we have spent in this Legislature, unanimously, without any very great flurry in this particular community, we have taken concrete steps towards the solution of the great problem of the city of Toronto and the county of York. That has been accomplished. Imagine far-reaching farm legislation which has been passed in this Session. In other days it would be regarded as almost earth-shattering in this province, yet it is accepted by our people as, perhaps, common-place. Then, consider the review of many other things and the changes in our election machinery. All of these things have been accomplished in these very spectacular days when people, and indeed we, ourselves may be blinded by the continuous

succession of great events which confront us. If we have had great events occurring here, how about the Parliament of Canada and the Parliaments of the nations of the world, the great problems they have to face, the great problems upon which world government and world order hinge. All of these things are part and parcel of the days in which we live. I know that these things in other days might be taken as a prelude of an election. I do not suppose that ever in the history of this province -- I am satisfied that never in the history of this province -- have so many things of great and vital interest to our people been accomplished. I know in other days, perhaps, those things would be taken as a prelude to an election. The fact is that I have known of elections to be announced in this very Legislature. Perhaps the fact that others have announced elections in this Legislature might be an indication that that was my intention. In what I do I am myself. I do not attempt to follow or to ape anybody else in connection with matters of importance to the people. The government and this House will have to take me as I am. My methods are different; my viewpoint is different. The fact the Government has sponsored and secured the enactment of the most advanced legislative program in the history of this province — which includes the complete modernization of our election laws -- has led to speculation of a general election.

I see the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon)

is reading The Toronto Daily Star.

MR. NIXON: I am all ears and I am listening to the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

MR. FROST: I see an item in the Star. I saw it a moment ago, "Speculation of General Election." It is on Page 3.

MR. NIXON: After the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) finishes, I will look it up.

MR. FROST: Indeed, some quite misinformed persons have gone so far as to assure the people, quite without foundation, that an election will be held during June.

The present Legislature, the 23rd, was elected on the 6th June, 1948. Its term will expire the 21st June, 1953.

Let me assure the House that the Government's advanced policies have been enacted for one reason, namely, the government's devotion to the cause of good government for the people of Ontario. An election in June has not been even remotely considered, and may I say that there has not been and there is not now any such intention.

I can honestly say that the government's policies and actions have not been predicated on political motives, but solely on doing a good job for our people in the face of most difficult times. I do not think the hon. members opposite should attribute political motives to us. We are dedicated to good government. Mere political advantage

will not be the motivating factors, but, rather, helping our people and our country in these perilous days in which we live. One can now give calmer consideration to what has taken place in dealing with another great subject.

I really thought the hon. members opposite, during the last few days, were going to burst out in a nervous rash, or something of the sort. I ask the hon. members opposite to be calm, to keep their feet on the ground, and view these great events which are taking place with calmness and consideration.

I should like to say something about amendments to our Constitution, and with particular reference to proposed amendments placed by the Federal Government before the provinces relative to Old-Age Pensions and to a provincial three per cent. retail turn-over tax. I do not think people can say, in dealing with those things, that I am avoiding or evading the issues or that I am timid. I point that out to the hon. members opposite.

At the outset, I may say that the Government of Ontario has already agreed to an amendment relative to Old-Age Pensions. Concerning the second amendment empowering the provinces to impose up to a three per cent. retail turn-over tax, I have explained our general view of this proposal. This proposal does not come from Ontario, but from some of the other provinces, for all of which I have the greatest respect. The provinces, that is, all of the other

provinces, of course, already have the right to impose a direct sales tax quite unlimited in extent. A number of these provinces have felt that they should have rights in the indirect field, and hence the proposal that they should be given the right, limited to three per cent. The province of Ontario is one of the provinces having no sales tax. It is one of the provinces, it is not the only province, which has not asked for this amendment.

As I said some few weeks ago, I recognize that compressed as are the provinces and municipalities by Federal invasion of the direct tax field, that some alternatives should be found for the provinces, and, incidentally, the municipalities. My own preference would be in favour of the Federal Government making some suitable arrangement to vacate the Liquor tax field so that the provinces would not only have the problems but the revenues. Indeed, I now express the hope that the Federal Government will make a start by not imposing new taxes in this field. The Province of Ontario might be pushed into a $10 million deficit by further Federal taxation of liquor. I think this would be the position with most of the provinces. One rational approach to better Federal-Provincial relations would be along this line, and I frankly think that it would be conducive to better administration, better government and better Federal-Provincial relations that this field should be

acknowledged as a Provincial one, so that the provinces having the difficult matter of administration would have control of the field from a taxation and revenue standpoint. I have expressed these views to the Minister of Finance and others and have stated them publicly, and I take this opportunity of re-affirming my position.

The background of the turn-over tax proposal is as follows -- Six of the provinces, -- British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, are now imposing direct sales tax in varying percentages. All provinces now have this constitutional right. In the last Federal-Provincial conference it was acknowledged that provinces, and incidentally municipalities, were being much compressed and restricted because of Federal needs in the direct tax field. Therefore, at the request of some of the provinces, the Federal Government made the proposal of a constitutional amendment permitting a three per cent. retail turn-over tax. I shall not further discuss the desirability of such a tax, which now can only be imposed by the Federal Government, but I will say that the proposal implies an important acknowledgment, that the provinces and municipalities require further taxing fields and that the Federal Government is prepared to face the situation, to the extent of making, I think, what is one of the most important concessions or proposals since

Confederation. This is quite aside from the merits of the proposal made.

I shall now turn to the constitutional issue, of which this matter is part and parcel. A conference which is still in being was commenced on January 10, 1950, with a view to finding ways and means of amending our constitution in Canada. The questions were:

(1) Should we have power in Canada to amend our own constitution in respect of matters which are of concern of both provincial and federal authorities, and

(2) If so, by what method?

The answer to the first question is clear. Certainly we should have such power. The second one, "If so, by what method?" presents many difficulties. Canada is a difficult country to govern. We have both territorial and racial difficulties. It is quite natural that certain parts of Canada would be most careful in agreeing to anything which might interfere with their fundamental rights. My hon. friends will see that. You only have to look at these two flags and the racial origins back of those flags, to know that is true. It was therefore agreed without any question at the outset that matters relating to language, schools, religious and minority rights, as entrenched in the British North America Act, should remain entrenched and that there should be no right to amend the constitution without unanimous consent.

(Take EE follows.)

In matters beyond what we might call the fundamentals, there is quite a wide difference of opinion. Some of the provinces felt that such amendments should be permitted with a set majority of the provinces without having regard to population. On the other hand, certain of the provinces felt that there should be a very much more rigid formula, which would require unanimous consent of the provinces.

Ontario's position is in the middle of the road. I do not think there is any essential difference between our position in this regard and that of the Federal Government. In fact, I have found my own personal position to be very similar to that of Mr. St. Laurent. In the January conference we submitted that the formula should be:

(a) elastic enough to meet the needs of a growing and developing nation;

(b) difficult enough to discourage indiscriminate tampering with our Constitution;

(c) rigid enough to provide ample safeguards to protect minorities and fundamentals and the federal system under which we have developed so satisfactorily during the last eighty-three years.

At that time I quoted, with approval, Mr. St. Laurent's letter of September 14, 1949, when calling the conference:--

"---it was the view of the government that a method should be worked out to amend our

constitution in Canada, and that any such method should include the fullest safeguards of provincial rights and jurisdiction, and the use of the two official languages and of those other rights which are the sacred trust of our national partnership."

Subsequently we proposed that in matters lying outside the fundamentals we would agree to an amending formula by which general amendments could be made by the Parliament of Canada, with the concurrence of two-thirds of the provinces, representing a majority of population. I may say we are not so rigid in that particular view. At the last conference it was felt undesirable to embarrass any of the provinces by pressing them for a settlement but that rather the placing of the two above-mentioned amendments before the provinces and the Government of Canada would perhaps indicate that everyone was prepared to work together with good will and that the fears expressed by some of the provinces were groundless.

In other words, here is an important point on the present issue. The conference felt that this matter should not be pressed as far as the ten provinces and the Federal Government were concerned, but, to take the two amendments and submit them to the provinces and see how that would work out, and see if that would give us the experience upon which

to find a formula. It was the view of Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent, that such a formula should be found, if at all possible.

That brings us up to the present position. We have two amendments proposed, one in relation to Old Age Pensions we are completely in favour of. We have agreed to the form. We are asking the Federal Government to enact the same, and we all believe here that the granting of universal old-age pensions would be a great forward step for our people. I imagine what the feelings of this Chamber would be if one of the provinces were to veto this proposal. That is the question you must consider. Suppose one of the provinces vetoed that proposal. That is the position we are in at the moment.

In connection with the other amendment, the situation is reversed. This Government is anything but enthusiastic about indirect sales taxes. Indeed, I have said in any event we have no intention of imposing such taxes. It has other preferences. No doubt that is the position of the House. On the other hand, I understand the Federal Government and the other nine provinces are generally in agreement. If we were to impose the veto we would run quite contrary to the formula which we have proposed for constitutional amendments. My hon. friend from London (Mr. Calder) will see the point there. What would be the reaction of the other governments?

I have no hesitation in saying that there is a

great and pressing need for an amending procedure for our constitution suited to meet the needs of a growing and developing nation. I believe that Federal-Provincial conferences will take an increasingly important place in our system of government. They are part of our national partnership. In order that they may function, first of all, there must be the spirit and the understanding lying back of them. For too many years, indeed, perhaps for a generation or more, they have been more of a forum for a clash of personalities, rather than accomplishment. This is why I said at the conference of January, 1950:

> "We believe that if this conference decided that there should be a method of amending our constitution, then the representatives here can find the way. If the Fathers of Confederation could find a basis for union -- an immensely difficult problem indeed -- we in 1950, in the same spirit, can find a way to make amendments ourselves which will be satisfactory to all the governments and to all the interests in our country."

In discussing the spirit necessary in these conferences, may I point out that no one province or one government can have its own way altogether. Ontario cannot and should not impose her will on the others, nor should the other provinces do that with us. In my dealings with Rt. hon. Mr. St. Laurent, the Prime Minister of Canada, and with the heads of the other

provincial governments, I have found every disposition to take the broad, understanding view of the problems of others. That applies to people of the party on the opposite end of the political axis than myself. I have had the most friendly approach from Mr. Douglas, of Saskatchewan; I have had the most friendly approach from Mr. Smallwood of Newfoundland, and from the Coalition Government and from Rt. Hon. Mr. St. Laurent himself.

MR. MacLEOD: What about Angus L. (Mr. MacDonald)?

MR. FROST: Mr. MacDonald is a great man, and I will say it was a great pleasure to do business with the fine people of Nova Scotia. I understand the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) comes from Nova Scotia, and perhaps that is one point in his favour. All of them have looked with sympathy and understanding on the problems of Ontario. I hope we have done the same with them. This is in my opinion the first and most necessary step to more rational Federal-Provincial relationships. Without that, Confederation in 1867 would not have been possible.

The importance of amending procedure cannot be over-estimated. We are a growing nation with new and almost unthought of problems coming up every day. We have before us a marketing bill providing for pooling arrangements. These arrangements may be invalidated by reason of the indirect taxation provisions of the British North America Act. The Fathers of Confederation never even remotely

considered such a thing. They had never heard of pooling arrangements. It is doubtful if any of them ever considered sales tax in any form. Income and corporation taxes were unheard of. The Fathers of Confederation never had the slightest idea that the provisions in connection with indirect taxation would ever affect the powers of the provinces in connection with marketing arrangements. We have to look at these problems in the light of 1951. Undoubtedly the idea behind the Fathers of Confederation in regard to indirect taxation had to do with tariffs as between the various provinces which were to be united. That is still valid to-day. I have stated that it is unthinkable to argue that the Federal Government should vacate personal income and

(Page EE-7 follows.)

the corporation tax fields because they are direct. This is impossible. I think it is just as invalid to argue that the provinces should never have any indirect rights. What about pooling and marketing of farm products?

I have madd this explanation to show the House that the problem concerns more than as to whether a sales tax, direct or indirect, is a good form of taxation or is desirable. Included in the bundle is the question as to how our constitution may be amended by a national partnership of free people, and how this machinery may be devised without placing the country in a strait-jacket, and at the same time safeguarding the rights of minorities and the fundamentals of our constitution. We have to exercise care that our views on say sales tax, whether exercised by either federal or provincial governments, do not adversely influence a broader question, namely, that of constitutional procedures suited to a great country like our own.

Concerning the constitutional amendment presently before the governments of Canada relative to Old-Age pensions, as has been indicated by correspondence tabled in this House, the Government of Ontario has agreed to either one of two forms submitted by the Federal Government. Therefore, as far as we are concerned, there is nothing that stands in the way of such an amendment. Some of the other provinces however have raised points which are going to require further negotiation. Yesterday, I duscussed this matter with the Hon. Mr. Garson by telephone, and I understand a letter is on its way to the provinces. As soon as this House prorogues my first efforts will be to use all of the influence of our

province to find answers agreeable to all others to the points raised by the other provinces, so that an amendment may be made to the British North America Act permitting the Federal Government to extend Old-Age Pensions without means tests to all persons over seventy years of age, and to permit pensions on a partnership basis between the Federal Government and the provinces to those sixty-five to sixty-nine inclusive. I have intimated to the Federal Government, and yesterday I again reaffirmed this with the Hon. Mr. Garson, that just as soon as the Federal Government passes the necessary legislative enactments, we will immediately reconvene this House to pass legislation to authorize Ontario's participation in such an arrangement. In view of the cost of living and the impact of the same on our senior citizens, we think that it is imperative that this become effective at once. Anything that we can do to that end will be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude. I have already spoken much longer than I intended, but these points are of great and pressing interest to our people, and should be dealt with. My feelings as regards the other provinces and the other governments are very adequately covered in that memorandum. We are prepared to deal with the other provinces and with the Federal Government in a spirit of give and take, with a view of making our contribution as best we can, in a spirit of friendship, and a spirit of understanding upon which this country was founded in

1867, by some of these great men whose pictures are outside this door, and in so doing we hope to make a further contribution to our province and our country.

(Take FF follows.)

Mr. Speaker, in concluding, and in appealing to this House for its support in the great Budget and the great program which we have given to this province, may I turn to the concluding paragraph of my Budget Address which I made on March 6 and which I make in no partisan spirit to this House at all, but which I make with the hope that here we may have people from different walks of life, from different parties uniting in what we think is a great program for this province.

> "The aim of all our efforts, has been to deal reasonably and justly with the problems of all our people. In discharging our responsibility as a government, we have striven to ensure equality of opportunity to each and every one of the citizens of the province. Whenever our citizens, through unforeseen circumstances, have been denied the opportunities which abound in this good land, the government, within the limits of its resources, and its constitutional powers, has done its utmost to ameliorate their condition. This is in keeping with what we are happy to call our 'Canadian way of life'. It is a good way -- no country on this earth offers a better way. For we have advanced farther in finding a solution of the economic and social problems of our citizens than has

been the case in any other country -- anywhere. We have come a long way in developing our civilization. We have maintained justice, and preserved freedom, without which there can be no civilization.

To-day we re-dedicate ourselves to the task of preserving our 'Canadian way of life' to the attainment of our goal, we pledge our unremitting endeavours."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Wismer has moved, seconded by Mr. Jolliffe,

'That the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply' be amended by adding thereto the following:

"But this House regrets that:

1. The Government has failed to take those steps within its own power to counteract the inflation which the Federal administration has refused to retrain;
2. The Government has failed to build the necessary hospitals, and to establish a contributory pre-paid hospital plan;
3. The facilities of the Department of

Agriculture and Labour are utterly inadequate;

4. The Government has failed to implement the Kennedy Report or any adequate Forest policy, with the result that many millions in revenue are lost each year;

5. The Government has failed to use its own legislation for public ownership of Brewers' Warehouses to tap the swollen profits of the brewing industry;

6. The Government has failed to abolish the Amusements tax, or to reduce the Gasoline tax.

7. The Government has persistently misinformed Old Man Ontario in its annual Budget forecasts and has, therefore, forfeited the confidence of this House and of the people of the province."

Amendement negatived on division.

Ayes 34,
Nays 48.

Motion agreed to; House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): The Department of Lands and Forests, Vote 115:

THE CHAIRMAN: Page 68, Department of Lands and Forests, Vote 115.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is difficult to resist the temptation of one more word to the Hon. Minister of

Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott). What does the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) think about the Committee on this timber management vote?

MR. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): The Committee of which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is a member?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. SCOTT: I think it is a mighty good thing. It is very unfortunate that so many of the hon. members were engaged for so long that they could not attend meetings earlier. Next season we will be looking forward -- if any of the hon. members opposite are here -- to starting early in the session.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is all terribly irregular. I regret to inform the House that the Mace is on the table.

MR. FROST: The Constitution has been shattered!

MR. JOLLIFFE: Does the Hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) imply that he does not want to see the standing Committee or the special Committee continued after the House prorogues?

MR. SCOTT: I imply that in the question of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). I do not think it is within my power to say, "Yes" or "No." I think it is a matter for decision by the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) as to whether it be a Select Committee or not.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr.

Chairman, I recognize there is some merit in what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) proposes, but it was never the intention that that Committee, or any other Committee of the House, should be Select Committees with power to sit unless authorized by the House. We have not regarded those Committees as Select Committees, but rather as Committees of the House. We will be proceeding this year. We have the advisory Committee which, of course, is made up of those who are experts outside of the House which will be sitting this year; but in the future Sessions we will see that that Committee is called early and if it appears, in the working out of the work of that Committee, it is desirable to have it sit between Sessions, I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) we will give it the greatest consideration.

(Take GG follows.)

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, just a question which I think it would be proper to ask now. Is it the intention of the Chairman of the Committee on Lands and Forests to present a report before we prorogue, covering the meetings held?

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I do not think that is necessary. This committee was only appointed to give the hon. members an opportunity to discuss matters with and ask questions of the Departmental officials and I do not know that a report is necessary. I hardly think it is.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is regular, though.

MR. FROST: Well, a formal report might be put in to say they had received reports from such and such officials, but other than that I think it is a mere formality.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report certain resolutions.

Motion agreed to; the House resumes (Mr. Speaker in the Chair).

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report it has come to certain resolutions, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: I am going to depart from the ordinary procedure on this occasion. After all, we are first in a great many things, and perhaps

this is a good time to be first in this regard. I will call third readings, instead of going into the Committee of Ways and Means.

Order No.1.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No.121, "An Act to Promote Fair Employment Practices in Ontario", Mr. Frost.

MR. FROST: The motion is already before the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is before the House, and the Speaker was asked to make a ruling on the amendment.

I can appreciate what it means to answer some questions in the time at my disposal, but I have done some research on this since yesterday afternoon. I hope the House will be patient, as I try to review the situation as I found it.

(GG3 follows)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frost moved the "Third Reading of Bill No. 121".

Upon presentation of the Motion by the Speaker, Mr. Calder moved an amendment, seconded by Mr. Brown,

> That the Bill be not now read a third time but referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to strike out the word "his" where it occurs in the fourth line of section 3 and insert therefor the word "sex", so that section 3 shall now read:
>
> "3. No employer or person acting on behalf of an employer shall refuse to employ or to continue to employ any person or discriminate against any person in regard to employment or any term of condition of employment because of the sex, race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin of such person."

The amendment having been put to the House was lost on a division of 33 affirmative to 42 negative. Mr. Jolliffe said:

> "I respectfully request, Mr. Speaker, that when the vote on the amendment is decided a vote be taken on the main question."

Mr. Speaker then ruled that, the amendment having been lost, the Motion for the Third Reading of the Bill was automatically carried.

I find that on April 7, 1949 (Hansard, pages 2149-2153) (Charitable Gifts Act) after several amendments had been submitted and voted upon, a final amendment submitted by Mr. MacLeod and seconded by Mr. Salsberg was submitted and negatived. Upon objection by Mr. Nixon that the defeat of the amendment meant the carrying of the original Motion, the House divided on the original Motion. The original Motion was sustained and the Speaker pronounced Third Reading of the Bill.

August 19, 1898, Votes and Proceedings, "An Act Respecting the Election Laws." Mr. Carscallen moved an amendment, seconded by Mr. Colquhoun, that the Bill be not now read a Second time. The amendment was lost on division. Following the division the "Motion for Second Reading having been then again put was carried".

August 24, 1898, Votes and Proceedings, on the Third Reading of the same Bill, i.e., "An Act Respecting the Election Laws", four amendments were submitted and four divisions taken, following which "the Motion for the Third Reading having been then again put was carried: yeas 46, nays 40, and the Bill was then read the Third Time and passed".

March 26, 1914, Votes and Proceedings, page 206, Bill No. 77, "To Amend the Assessment Act". Motion for the Second Reading was lost on division and "so it was declared in the negative" -- evidently without vote.

April 4, 1950, Hansard FF - 1, Labour Relations Act:- Mr. Speaker -- Of course, I can only go by the rules, and rule 56 does state explicitly -- and it is

quite within the perogative of the House to change these rules -- and I know the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has brought the point up and I can see the point, but there is the law.

MR. JOLLIFFE: How does it read, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Rule No. 56, page 114:

> "If on an amendment to the question that a Bill be now read a second time or the third time, it is decided that the word "now" or any words proposed to be left out stand part of the question, Mr. Speaker shall forthwith declare the bill to be read a second or the third time, as the case may be."
>
> and the amendment does read that all words after "that" be left out and I should say that while I fully appreciate both the thought of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), I can only go by the rules"

It will be appreciated from the examples which I have given that there has been no strict adherence to Rule 56. It is the duty of Mr. Speaker to seek to rule the House from three angles: - (I) the acceptance of the fact that the House is always allowed to change or override a rule; (2) through the application of the rules of procedure which are laid down in the rule book; (3) by referring to precedents which have been used by former Speakers and himself.

In connection with the application of this rule (Rule 56, page 114, Lewis' "Parliamentary Procedure"), which reads as follows:-

> "If on an amendment to the question that a bill be now read a second time or the third time, it is decided that the word "now", or any words proposed to be left out stand part of the question, Mr. Speaker shall forthwith declare the bill to be read a second or the third time, as the case may be."

the first of these yardsticks, namely the overriding of the rule by consent of the House, has frequently been applied. The same may be said to be true of the other two guides which form the basis of Mr. Speaker's judgments.

Where the rules of this House are questioned by any Honourable Member, the rules lay down that Mr. Speaker shall refer to the conduct of the British House of Commons. In that regard I have found

May's "Parliamentary Practice" (Thirteenth Edition):

> "If on an amendment to the question for the second or the third reading of a bill determines that the word "now" or any other words proposed to be left out of the question shall stand part of the question, the Speaker is directed forthwith to declare that the bill has been read a second or third time, as the case may be."

This is Standing Order No. 33 of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom, which it will be noticed is exactly the same as Rule 56 of this House.

Since this matter has been quite contentious on several occasions during my term as Speaker, I find that my general practice has been to follow the rule, e.g., the ruling I have quoted for April 4, 1950. While, as I have said, the rule may not appear to be in accordance with the general accepted practice of dealing with motions and amendments, I must, however, conclude that until the House rules otherwise I must adhere to a reasonable interpretation of the rules, and that in the case of Bill No. 121, the amendment having been negatived, the Third Reading of the Bill automatically follows.

However, I would emphasize again that the House is a Master unto itself and with its consent may agree to a vote being taken.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do you consent?

MR. FROST: Are you asking for consent?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I never believe in taking advantage of technicalities. I think that things should be decided as much as possible on their merits. However, I think I should take this opportunity of saying that you have settled by your ruling the rules of the House, and we will understand in the future they apply, unless the Committee of the House amends the rules.

I think the practice of having motions on

third readings is undesirable. In all fairness to the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder), I think his motion should have been brought up on second reading, where it would be subject to debate and consideration. The effect of bringing up such motions as he did on third readings, deprives the hon. members of the opportunity of debate, which applies on second readings. I think it is very bad practice.

I think, furthermore, we should understand that is the law, and should govern ourselves accordingly, and if these motions are to be brought up, they should be brought up on second reading. As you say in your judgment, Mr. Speaker, we have viewed this with some latitude. I have no disposition to take advantage of placing the hon. members in a false light, because of a technicality, and I have agreed that a vote shall be taken in this case, but I do not think we should be asked to do this again. I think hereafter these matters should be confined to second reading.

I think that disposes of the matter now. I am not taking advantage of the use of the force we have here to impose upon the hon. members of this House a position they do not want to take. I think that is the generous attitude to take. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that after this we will follow the rules.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not sure the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) appreciates that the rule is the same for second reading as for third. So when the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) says that hereafter he hopes that

these amendments will be moved on second reading, he is not distinguishing between the rule as to second readings, and the rule as to third readings.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Calder) might have moved his amendment on second reading, that the words "sex" be inserted in section so-and-so. It might have been done on second reading, or by an amendment in Committee.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I say in that regard there was an amendment moved on second reading of the same Bill. In fairness, I think I should point out that Mr. Speaker was not actually in the Chair on that occasion. Nevertheless, the amendment was moved. The House divided on the amendment, and it was my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Frost) who asked for a division on the main motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This thing cuts both ways. The Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has forgotten about that. He forgets how often they have to ask for consent. I would have thought it presumptuous and unfair to have denied a vote which the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) wanted. I am glad the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has consented to a vote on this occasion. I may say, with great deference to Mr. Speaker, that I may on another day again argue the ruling, and I think there are very good legal grounds for doing so.

May I also say, with great deference to you,

Mr. Speaker, that I believe there is a typographical error in your ruling. There was an objection credited to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), which was actually made by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Blackwell). Hansard tells the story very clearly. That was the day when there were many amendments on third reading, and after the defeat of all the amendments, the House divided.

MR. SPEAKER: I find myself in the peculiar position of having to go against my rulings immediately.

The vote is on the main motion.

Call in the members.

(Take HH follows.)

Motion agreed to on Division:

Ayes 82

Nays 0

Third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

MR. FROST: Second Order.

BEDS OF NAVIGABLE WATERS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, Third Reading, Bill No. 145, "An Act to Amend the Beds of Navigable Waters Act". Mr. Scott (Peterborough).

HON. H. R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 145.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

MR. FROST: Third order.

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading, Bill No.116, "An Act to Amend the Farm Products Marketing Act", Mr. Kennedy.

HON. T. L. KENNEDY (Minister of Agriculture): I move third reading of Bill No. 116.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

MR. FROST: Fourth Order.

THE COMPANIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOURS: 4th Order, Third Reading, Bill No.155, "An Act to Amend The Companies Act", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.155.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 5th Order.

PHARMACY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 5th Order, third reading, Bill No.156, "An Act to Amend the Pharmacy Act," Mr. Phillips.

HON. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.156.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER:Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 6th Order.

VOTERS' LISTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 6th Order, third reading of Bill No.109, "The Voters' Lists Act, 1951." Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.109.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

MR. FROST: 7th Order.

ELECTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 7th Order, third reading, Bill No.110, "The Election Act, 1951." Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.110.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 8th Order.

THE ACTIVE SERVICE ELECTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 8th Order, third reading, Bill No.134, "The Active Service Election Act, 1951". Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.134.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 9th Order.

INSURANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 9th Order, third reading, Bill No.154, "An Act to Amend The Insurance Act." Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr.

Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.154.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 10th Order.

UNIFORMITY OF ASSESSMENT IN GREATER TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order, third reading, Bill No.153, "An Act to Provide for Uniformity of Assessment in Greater Toronto". Mr. Dunbar.

HON. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.153.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 11th Order.

CHARITIES ACCOUNTING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 11th Order, third reading, Bill No.158, "An Act to Amend the Charities Accounting Act," Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.158.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 12th Order.

OPTOMETRY ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 12th Order, third reading,

Bill No.159, "An Act to Amend The Optometry Act". Mr. Phillips.

HON. M. PHILLIPS (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I move third reading of Bill No.159,

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 13th Order.

INCOME TAX ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 13th Order, third reading, Bill No.160, "An Act to Amend The Income Tax Act (Ontario) in respect of Income of the Calendar Year 1950". Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading, Bill No.160.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 14th Order.

POWER COMMISSION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 14th Order, third reading, Bill No.161, "An Act to Amend the Power Commission Act". Mr. Frost.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move third reading, Bill No. 161.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: 15th Order.

FACTORY, SHOP AND OFFICE-BUILDING ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 15th Order, third reading, Bill No.92, "An Act to Amend the Factory, Shop and Office-Building Act." Mr. Gordon.

MR. G. T. GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.92.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: Third reading, Bill No.157.

STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third reading of Bill No.157, "The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1951", Mr. Porter.

HON. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No.157.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there is no objection. I just rise to point out that this is by consent.

MR. PORTER: Well, I assumed it would be, and I assumed rightly.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

(Take II follows.)

THE CLERK-ASSISTANT: Mr. Patrick from the Committee of Supply, reports the following amounts --

MR.FROST:Mr.Speaker,I move we dispense with the reading of this concurrence. The statement is already on the desks of the hon. members, and I do not think it is necessary to read these items. I move they be dispensed with.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into the Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Ways and Means, (Mr. Patrick in the Chair.)

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolved that there be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this province a sum not exceeding two hundred and thirty-one million, eight hundred and ninety-six thousand, two hundred and five dollars, to meet the supplies to that extent granted to His Majesty.

Resolution agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee rise and report a certain resolution.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means begs to report a certain resolution, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Doucett, that leave be given to introduce a Bill, intituled, "An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain sums of Monies, for the Public Service, for the Fiscal Year ended the 31st day of March, 1951, and for services for the Fiscal Year ended the 31st day of March, 1952." and that same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, before I leave to escort His Honour to this Chamber, I would like to ask your permission to call upon the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to table certain radio broadcasts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Speaker, at the urgent request of the hon. members of the House, who havebeen thirsting for the knowledge which would be gained by reading certain broadcasts, I beg to table a series of those broadcasts, because, after all, as I have mentioned before, the broadcasts were written and prepared by the C.B.C., and are broadcast at an hour in the

mornings so they can be heard in the schools, for the benefit of the pupils of this province, and include a variety of subjects.

For instance, the first one is a series of B.B.C.Traveltalks, and the title is, "The Swiss and their Cows".

In addition to that, they have current events every day for a portion of the period and they take the lives of certain persons whom they call "Very Important Persons", people from all walks of life, generally people at the top of affairs, and in most cases the people who were the subjects for these broadcasts were taken at the request of the pupils of the schools, as the result of the pupils writing in.

I may say that from these it is apparent that the pupils of our schools have shown excellent judgment, and these are not confined to one political view, or to one country, but they have shown their interest in all sorts of people, and have taken as subjects those learned in various aspects of world affairs.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I hope they did not have to wait as long as we did.

MR. PORTER: It took some time to get these typed out. The hon. members are always complaining about the poor script they get in Hansard, but we have done a good job for the benefit of the hon. members.

I notice here one on the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations, Nasrollah Entezam of Iran.

The second one is that of Hon. Lester Pearson, the Canadian Minister of External Affairs.

The third is that of Sir Benegal Rau, a member of the United Nations Cease-Fire Committee.

The next one is Maj-Gen Dwight Eisenhower.

The next one is of Pope Pius XII.

The next one is that of none other than Hon. Leslie M. Frost, Prime Minister of Ontario.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: The next is that of Mao Tze Tung. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will correct me is my pronunciation is wrong.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: The next is about Viscount Alexander of Tunis, the Governor-General of Canada. The next one is Johann Brawsz.

The next is that of Rt. Hon. Louis St.Laurent, the Prime Minister of Canada.

And the next is concerning --

MR.MacLEOD: Concerning the Hon. Mr. Dunbar?

MR. PORTER: Joseph Stalin.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) will correct me if I have pronounced his name wrongly.

The next is the Rt. Hon. Robert G. Menzies,--

or, as they say in Scotland --"Mingis" -- the Premier of Australia.

I have great pleasure in tabling these broadcasts for the edification of the hon. members of the House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All I can say is, "Better late than never". I must congratulate the Government on its remarkable sense of timing in relation to this matter.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of privilege and draw to your attention something which I think is merely an error. The flags hanging in this Chamber are wrongly placed. We honour France as a great ally, but at the same time, we respect our own Jack, and through tradition and usage, a position has been granted to the Jack, and I think we should be jealous enough of it to take that position.

HON. G. H. DOUCETT (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I may say in reply to the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) that this was noticed when I came into the Chamber this afternoon, and it will be changed immediately, when the sitting is over. It is simply a matter of order, whether it be to our right as we come in or go out, but it will be corrected.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, may I have your permission to go and escort His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, to the Chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: Permission granted.

The hon. the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario entered the Chamber, of the Legislative Assembly, and being seated upon the throne:

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has at its present sittings thereof passed several Bills to which in the name and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

(PAGE II-7 follows)

THE CLERK ASSISTANT: May it please your Honour; the following are the Titles of the Bills to which Your Honour's Assent is prayed:-

Bill No. 1,	An Act respecting the City of Niagara Falls.
Bill No. 2	An Act respecting the Rideau Club.
Bill No. 3	An Act respecting Barclays Trust Company of Canada.
Bill No. 4	An Act resepcting Wycliffe College.
Bill No. 5	An Act respecting The Jewish Congregation Anshe-Sholem of Hamilton.
Bill No.	An Act respecting The United Church of Canada.
Bill No. 8	An Act respecting General Trust of Canada.
Bill No. 9	An Act respecting the City of Sarnia.
Bill No. 10	An Act respecting the City of St. Thomas.
Bill No. 11	An Act respecting the Township of Moore.
Bill No. 12	An Act respecting the City of Woodstock.
Bill No. 13	An Act respecting the City of Fort William.
Bill No. 14	An Act respecting the City of London.
Bill No. 15	An Act respecting The Young Men's Christian Association of Greater Niagara.
Bill No. 16	An Act respecting the Jewish Community Centre of Toronto.
Bill No. 18	An Act respecting The Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ontario and St.Thomas Church, Belleville.
Bill No. 19	An Act respecting the City of Hamilton.
Bill No. 20	An Act respecting the Windsor Utilities Commission.
Bill No. 21,	An Act respecting the City of Belleville.
Bill No. 22,	An Act respecting the Incorporated Synod of the Diocese of Ottawa.

Bill No. 23	An Act respecting the Township of East York.
Bill No. 24	An Act respecting the City of Ottawa.
Bill No. 26	An Act respecting the City of Oshawa.
Bill No. 27	An Act respecting the City of Toronto.
Bill No. 28	An Act respecting The Brockville General Hospital.
Bill No. 29	An Act to incorporate The Greater Niagara General Hospital.
Bill No. 31	An Act respecting Victoria University.
Bill No. 33	An Act respecting the City of St. Catharines.
Bill No. 35	An Act to confirm the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1950.
Bill No. 37	An Act to amend The Racing Commission Act.
Bill No. 38,	An Act to amend The County Judges Act.
Bill No. 40,	An Act to amend The Deserted Wives' and Children's Maintenance Act.
Bill No. 41	An Act to amend The Justices of the Peace Act.
Bill No. 42	An Act to amend The Land Titles Act.
Bill No. 43	An Act to amend the Unclaimed Articles Act.
Bill No. 44	An Act to amend The Department of Education Act.
Bill No. 45	An Act to amend The School Sites Act.
Bill No. 46,	An Act to amend The Vocational Education Act.
Bill No. 48	An Act to amend The Public Service Act.
Bill No. 49	An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
Bill No. 50	An Act to amend The Day Nurseries Act.
Bill No. 51	An Act to amend The Adoption Act.
Bill No. 53,	An Act to amend The Planning Act.

Bill No. 54	An Act to amend The Mining Act.
Bill No. 58,	An Act to amend The Training School Act.
Bill No. 66	An Act to amend The Workmen's Comensation Act
Bill No. 67	An Act to amend The Railway Fire Charge Act
Bill No. 71	An Act to amend The Change of Name Act.
Bill No. 72	An Act to amend The Boards of Education Act.
Bill No. 73	An Act to amend The Continuation Schools Act.
Bill No. 74,	An Act to amend The Public Schools Act
Bill No. 75	An Act to amend The Teachers' Superannuation Act.
Bill No. 76	An Act to amend The Fire Departments Act
Bill No. 77	An Act to amend The Housing Development Act.
Bill No. 78	An Act to amend The Mental Hospitals Act
Bill No. 79	An Act to amend The Santoria for Consumptive Act.
Bill No. 80	The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1951.
Bill No. 81	An Act to amend The Old Age Pensions Act.
Bill No. 82	An Act to amend The Homes for the Aged Act.
Bill No. 83	An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act.
Bill No. 91	An Act to amend The Natural Gas Conservation Act.
Bill No. 92	An Act to amend The Factory, Shop and Office Building Act.
Bill No. 93	An Act to amend The Highway Improvement Act.
Bill No. 95	An Act to amend The Police Act.
Bill No. 96	An Act to amend The Trustee Act.
Bill No. 99	An Act to amend The Liquor Licence Act.

Bill No. 100	An Act to a mend The High Schools Act.
Bill No. 101	An Act to amend The Public Officers Fees Act.
Bill No. 102	An Act to amend The Judicature Act.
Bill No. 103	An Act to amend The Coroners Act.
Bill No. 104	An Act to amend The Wolf and Bear Bounty Act.
Bill No. 105	An Act to amend The Forest Fires Prevention Act.
Bill No. 106	An Act to amend The Private Forest Reserves Act.
Bill No. 108	An Act respecting Gas Pipe Lines.
Bill No. 109	The Voters' Lists Act, 1951.
Bill No. 110	The Election Act, 1951.
Bill No. 111	An Act to amend The Children's Protection Act.
Bill No. 112	An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowance Act.
Bi[illegible]	An Act to amend The Unemployment Relief Act.
Bill No. 114	An Act to amend The Oleomargarine Act.
Bill No. 116	An Act to amend The Farm Products Marketing Act.
Bill No. 119	An Act to amend The Jurors Act.
Bill No. 120	An Act to ensure Fair Remuneration to Female Employees.
Bill No. 121	An Act to promote Fair Employment Practices in Ontario.
Bill No. 122	An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act.
Bill No. 123	An Act to amend The Local Improvement Act.
Bill No. 124	An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act.
Bill No. 125	An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

Bill No. 126	An Act to amend The Assessment Act.
Bill No. 127	An Act to amend The Municipal Act.
Bill No. 130	An Act to amend The Game and Fisheries Act.
Bill No. 131	An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.
Bill No. 132	An Act to approve an Agreement between Canada and Ontario respecting the Development of the Niagara River.
Bill No. 133	An Act to provide for the Regulation of Leaseholds.
Bill No. 134	The Active Service Election Act, 1951.
Bill No. 135	An Act to amend The Escheats Act.
Bill No. 136	An Act to amend The Law Society Act.
Bill No. 137	An Act to amend The Mining Act.
Bill No. 138	An Act to amend The Community Centres Act.
Bill No. 139	An Act respecting the Registration of Nurses.
Bill No. 140	An Act respecting Nursing.
B ill No.141	An Act to amend The Niagara Parks Act.
Bill No. 142	An Act to amend The Registry Act.
Bill No. 143	An Act to amend The Alcoholism Research Foundation Act.
Bill No. 144	An Act to amend The Public Health Act.
Bill No. 145	An Act to amend The Beds of Navigable Waters Act.
Bill No. 146	An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems.
Bill No. 147	An Act to amend The Land Transfer Tax Act.
Bill No. 148	An Act to amend The Succession Duty Act.
B ill No.149	An Act to amend The Provincial Loans Act.
Bill No. 150	An Act to amend The Hospitals Tax Act.

Bill No. 151	An Act to authorize the Raising of Money on the Credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.
Bill No. 152	An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.
Bill No. 153	An Act to provide for Uniformity of Assessment in Greater Toronto.
Bill No. 154	An Act to amend The Insurance Act.
Bill No. 155	An Act to amend The Companies Act.
Bill No. 156	An Act to amend The Pharmacy Act.
Bill No. 157	The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1951.
Bill No. 158	An Act to amend The Charities Accounting Act.
Bill No. 159	An Act to amend The Optometry Act.
Bill No. 160	An Act to suspend The Income Tax Act (Ontario) in respect of Income of the Calendar Year 1950
Bill No. 161	An Act to amend The Power Commission Act.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: In His Majesty's name, the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor of the province doth assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We, His Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of the province of Ontario, in Session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to His Majesty's person and Government, and humbly beg to present for Your Honor's acceptance a Bill intituled, "An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the fiscal year ended the 31st day of March, 1951, and for the public service for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1952.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: The hon. the Lieutenant-Governor of the province doth thank His Majesty's dutiful and loyal

subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill in His Majesty's name.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to deliver the following gracious speech:

(PAGE II-14 FOLLOWS)

HIS HONOUR, RAY LAWSON (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker and members of the Legislative Assembly, it is now my duty to prorogue the third session of the Twenty-third Legislature of the Province of Ontario. Before doing so I wish to thank you in the name of His Majesty for your diligent and loyal attention to the business of the people of this Province. I wish also to express some comment upon particular matters which have come before you and to which you have applied your faithful endeavour.

Many Public Bills have received sanction. All of these measures will benefit the people of the Province and are consistent with the desire of my Government to perform its duties faithfully as their servants and to progress with the continuing development and economic expansion of the Province. Some of these measures necessarily have come about by reason of dangerous developments in world conditions and by reason of the grave need of our nation to assume most heavy responsibilities toward the preservation of its own security and of that of the free world. Other measures reflect the grave concern of my Government in relation to the soaring costs upon our people in their day to day living and in relation to the need to restrain and contain the inflationary influences of these troubled and extraordinary times.

It is my wish to mention particularly a few of these measures. Legislation has been approved which is of great and historic importance to the women of the

Province. The place of women in the social and economic life of Ontario has been given the widest recognition. Under a measure of progressive significance, they will be entitled to fair remuneration in comparison with men who do similar work with them. By another measure women will be entitled to play their very necessary part in the administration of justice by their having been granted eligibility to serve on juries.

Of very great significance is a measure which will promote fair employment practices in Ontario. In recognition of the fundamental equality of the human person in the right to employment, discrimination against men and women in respect of their employment because of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin is now contrary to the law of the Province, a provision of our law which will meet with a sincere welcome by our people.

A measure has been approved which will bring very great benefit to the farm people of the Province. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, acting in conjunction with The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission and the Department of Lands and Forests, will undertake a broad program of examination into the rural telephone situation in the Province. Expert technical and other advice will be made available to our many rural telephone organizations, and other forms of practical assistance will be offered. It is expected confidently that the examinations and surveys made under the authority of this measure will lead soon to real

improvement in the rural telephone facilities presently existing and to important solutions of the problems as a whole.

In view of the special problems presented by these extraordinary times, and of particular relation to the economy of our Province, certain measures of control have been approved. I refer particularly to legislation which will give the necessary authority to regulate leasholds and rentals of dwelling places. The interests of all concerned with dwelling leasholds will be given careful examination by a select committee of the Legislature with a view to devising a system of leasehold regulation which will be fair and equitable to every way. I wish to refer also to a measure which will provide the authority to the Milk Control Board of Ontario to fix maximum prices at which milk may be sold for consumer use. Consumer representation has been added to the Board.

Many other measures have received sanction which will bring great benefit to our people and will keep Ontario in the forefront of the great democratic states. It is worthy of special note that children in the elementary grades will receive free school books; action which will carry forward in important fashion the desire of my Government to provide educational facilities for our growing nation, unexcelled anywhere.

A select committee of the Legislature has been created for the purpose of examining into all phases of the administration of criminal justice within the Province. Its endeavours will be directed toward the finding of ways

and means of improving this important branch of government administration so that complete fairness and impartiality, both in the interests of the state and of the citizen, will be strengthened where possible.

In order that the people of the Province, who are the real owners of The Hydro-Electric Power Commission, shall have a closer contact with the affairs of the Commission; a measure has been approved which increases the representative functions of the Advisory Council to the Commission. Among other interests to be thus represented in the affairs of Hydro will be the Municipalities, and, of very much importance, the women of the Province.

Special mention should be made of improvements to the Workmen's Compensation Act which will bring further benefits to injured workmen and their dependents.

The legislation in relation to elections has been given careful consideration and substantial improvements have been sanctioned. In the light of these difficult days the franchise has again been extended to members of the forces who are serving away from their homes.

Many other measures have been passed which assist our people and tend to the betterment of conditions. Progressive improvements have been made in many fields. Among these may be listed: the marketing of farm products, the licensing of establishments for the sale of liquor, the payment of Mothers' Allowances, the protection of deserted wives and children, the transmission of natural gas, and the fields of the administration of

justice and the management of our natural resources. Other measures which will better our already high standard of public health, and which will improve the carrying out of its duties by the Department of Education, have received sanction.

Many other matters have received consideration and approval. Among them should be mentioned twenty-eight Private Bills dealing with matters of special importance to those concerned.

Adequate and satisfactory financial provision for the ensuing year has been made. The demand for funds to meet the requirements of my Government has been higher than ever before. Nevertheless through the careful application of sound fiscal policies, it has not been necessary to impose new or increased taxation. In fact the contrary is true and my Government has been able to effect a reduction in the hospitals tax without in any way limiting the assistance which will be given to hospitals. Additional financial benefits are being provided within the social security fields, notably in improved Mothers' Allowances and further assistance to Homes for the Aged. Much gratification is expressed respecting the secure and well founded financial condition of our Province, and much encouragement is taken from the continuing application of these policies.

May I express my thanks for the appropriation of public funds for the purposes to which I have just referred. I am confident that under the guidance of Divine Providence, the well-being and security of the

people of this Province will be strengthened. May I thank you also for your progressive and loyal services as legislators.

His Honour was then pleased to retire.

Hon. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly; it is the will and pleasure of the hon. the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued, and this Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

The House prorogued at 6.02 of the clock p.m.

- - - - - - - - - - -